A

DEMONSTRATION OF THE MESSIAS.

In which the Truth of the

CHRISTIAN RELIGION

Is defended, eſpecially againſt

The Jews.

PART III.

By the Right Reverend Father in God, *Richard*, Lord Biſhop of *Bath* and *Wells*.

AUGUSTIN:

Quid illis miſerius quibus ipſe Salvator ſalutì non erit?

LONDON,

Printed by *J. H.* for *W. Rogers* at the *Sun*, and *M Wotton* at the *Three Daggers* in *Fleetſtreet*, 1700.

THE PREFACE.

SOME things there are, which I think my ſelf obliged to acquaint the Reader *with in this Place, to prevent a Miſunderſtanding, and to juſtifie my way of proceeding in this* Third Part *againſt the* Jews. *Had it not been for that, I ſhould willingly have ſpared my ſelf the Trouble of a PREFACE.*

And Firſt, *I am bound to account for a great Omiſſion, which I may be plauſibly enough charged with. The intelligent* Reader *will ſay that, when I undertook to prove that the* Meſſias *is already come, and thought fit to inſiſt upon* Ge-

neſis 49. 10. *and upon* Haggai *ch.* 2. I *ought to have conſidered* Daniel's *Weeks, and that the Work is imperfect without a Diſcourſe upon that Subject. I do grant that all this is true: But I have this to ſay for my ſelf, that I was prevented in that Matter by a far better Hand; and the* Reader *will be ſo far from a juſt Cauſe of Complaint for my omitting it, that he is like to be a great Gainer on that Account. A very Reverend and Learned Prelate of this Church did many Years ago take that Argument upon himſelf, hath printed ſeveral Sheets already, and given me leave to aſſure the* Reader *that he will finiſh it.*

Again, *The* Reader *may perhaps cenſure me for the* Third Chapter *of this* Third Part *of my Book. He may truly ſay it does not come into its proper Place. For I having undertaken in my* Second Part *to anſwer*

ſwer the Jews *Objections againſt the New Teſtament, the Places which are here conſidered ought to have come then, in their due Place. And he that affirms this is certainly in the right.*

But then I have this to offer for my Excuſe, that ſometime it was, after the Second Part *was printed off, and indeed after part of the* Third *was ſent up to be printed, that I met with thoſe Objections, which I have in that Chapter endeavoured to anſwer. Thus it was; a very Learned Friend, that knew what I was about, ſent me down a* MS. *called* Porta Veritatis. *The* Jew *who was the Author of it, calls himſelf by the Name of* Jacob Aben-Amram, *and wrote this Book in the Year (according to our Account)* 1634. *This* MS. *was found in the Library of the very Learned Dr.* Cudworth. *I believe it to be*

one of those which he purchased of M. Ben-Israel, *at a very great Rate, of which I have sometime heard him make mention. Be that as it will; I take it to be the greatest Effort against* Christianity *that hath ever been made, or is ever like to be made against it. In perusing this* MS. *I met with very many Objections in it against several Places in the New Testament. Many of them I had considered in the* Second Part. *But there were some that were new to me: And not knowing into what Hand this* MS. *might sometime or other fall, I resolved to consider them; and then was obliged to print them in that Place they are found in, when I could not put them into that Place to which they did of Right belong. In the following Parts of my Discourse, I did very carefully consider what that subtle* Jew *had to offer against what I had*

to

to ſay on the behalf of Chriſtianity, *and have not failed to repreſent the full Force of his Reaſonings, and to reply upon him in its proper Place. This put me to ſome new Trouble, and alſo put ſome ſtop to the Preſs: But I rather choſe this Fatigue, and to run the hazard of being cenſured as Immethodical, than to let that paſs unanſwered which was laid in my way.*

Again, *The* Reader, *perhaps, might juſtly have expected that, when I treat ſo largely of* Gen. 49. 10 *I ſhould have throughly conſidered what is advanced on that Place by a very Learned Perſon of* Amſterdam, *in his Commentary on* Geneſis, *printed there* A. D. 1693. *And I do own that I ought to have done ſo, and did deſign it. But herein I was prevented by a Learned Man that hath done it to my Hand, and excuſed me from* S. Edzardus, de Shiloh. Lond. 1698.

that Labour. And I hope the Learned Author of that Commentary will conſider that Matter again: If he do it with due Application, I cannot but hope he will anſwer himſelf, and give the Church better ſatisfaction in this Matter than he hath hitherto done.

Some perhaps may complain that I have produced large Quotations in Greek, *out of* Philo *and* Theodoret, *which ſwells the Book, and increaſeth the Charge; whereas it might have ſufficed to have referred to the Authors. I cannot take it ill if the* Reader *ſhould make this Exception, becauſe I was ſometime of the ſame Opinion my ſelf; and have, at other times, induſtriouſly ſpared the* Reader *that Trouble: And I had drawn up what I had to ſay, with References to* Philo. *But upon ſecond Thoughts, and better Advice, I altered my Mind. It is a weighty*

weighty Argument which I am upon, when I have occaſion to produce thoſe Teſtimonies, and in which the Jews *and* Socinians *(a ſubtle ſort of People) are much concerned: And I leave the* Reader *to judge, upon his ſecond Thoughts, whether, or not, it were not moſt adviſable to do as I did. Every* Reader *hath not theſe Books. I have quoted them, and tranſlated them truly; and if the Printer (after the utmoſt Care) miſtake in ſome few Letters of the* Greek, *that, I hope, the* Reader *will not impute to me.*

I am farther to acquaint the Reader, *that after I had ſent my Papers to the Preſs, I received from a Friend, from* Oxford, *a Book lately printed, that is intituled* Bilibra Veritatis. *It is written by ſome* Socinian, *with very great Heat and Rancour, with virulent Reflections upon, and contumelious Reproaches*

proaches of his Adverſary: 'Tis full of that Stuff, to an high Degree of Rudeneſs and Inhumanity. He does inſolently and haughtily deſpiſe the Ancient Fathers; and ſpares not other Learned Men, as they come in his way. His Deſign is to prove, that the Chaldee Paraphraſts, *when they mention the WORD, are not to be underſtood of a PERSON, or ſubſtantial Word; and that they are miſapplied to that purpoſe by our Writers. Had it come to my Hands in due Time, I ſhould have conſidered it in the following Papers, in its due Place: But now a few Strictures will be as much as a PREFACE will allow me.*

This I cannot but ſay of the Book, that if all the contumelious and reproachfull Language and the Impertinencies were taken out of it, the remaining part would be of very little Bulk: The former I do not think

worthy

worthy of any further notice; the latter I may have occaſion to reflect upon.

He calls our Belief of an ETERNAL WORD a Figment, at the very beginning of his Book; and elſewhere affirms that the Chaldees *do never denote a Reaſonable Perſon by the* Word of the Lord; *and elſewhere ſays, that if theſe* Targumiſts *had denoted the* Meſſias *by this Expreſſion, yet he ſhould not think himſelf bound to believe them: And what he ſays in this laſt Place, the* Reader *may take his Word for; becauſe he believes not St.* John, *who expreſly does it.* Bilibra. P. 4 p. 137. p. 9.

It is very boldly ſaid by him, that it cannot be proved that the Targumiſts, *by the* WORD of the LORD, *do at any Time denote,* Perſonam ratiocinantem & per ſe ſubſiſtentem. *This Author, in another Place, contradicts himſelf.* P. 137. cum p. 25, & p. 149.

For

For upon thoſe words Gen 35. 9. God appeared unto *Jacob, which the* Targumiſt *renders by the* WORD *of God, this Author adds,* Undè colligitur, verbum Domini ibi non differre ab ipſo Domino. *And yet this is that which he utterly denies in another Place,*

P. 51, cum P. 42, & P. 46. *with a mighty Confidence. Again, he expounds* the WORD of the LORD, *in the* Targumiſt, *to denote an* Angel, *in ſeveral other Places,* c. g. *Exod.* 12. 23. *The* LORD will paſs: *The* Targumiſt *hath it,* the WORD of the LORD, *as this Author cites him;* Hoc eſt, Angelus Domini, *ſays this Author. So that he plainly refutes himſelf, and affirms in one Place what he contradicts in another.*

It would be a very hard Task to

P. 16, cum P. 20. *reconcile this Author to himſelf. I will give another Inſtance; ſpeaking*

ing of the Jeruſalem Targum, *which* Vechner *produceth againſt him, he blames him for it, and adds,* Cùm omnino incertum ſit num hæc Paraphraſis unquam Johanni Evangeliſtæ conſpecta ſit, &c. *Here he ſays, it is uncertain whether St.* John *ever ſaw that Paraphraſe, or not. There is a wide Difference between this, and what he ſays afterward in theſe words,* De Hieroſolymitano nulla dubitandi ratio eſt, cum Evangeliſtæ noſtro nunquam fuiſſe conſpectum. *So that in one Place he affirms it to be* uncertain *whether St.* John *ever ſaw that Paraphraſe, or not; and ſoon after, that it is* undoubtedly certain *that he never ſaw it. For my part, I cannot reconcile him to himſelf. And tho' 'tis all one to me whether he ever ſaw it or not, yet I cannot underſtand how the ſame Man can affirm that*

that a Matter is uncertain, *and yet* undoubtedly certain *alſo.*

But this Author is reſolved however that the Targumiſts *ſhall not ſpeak on our behalf: And though ſome Perſonal Acts are imputed to the WORD by them, yet he is willing to try his Wits in this Cauſe, rather than allow that Word to denote a PERSON. We read, indeed,* The Lord hath ſworn *that* the Lord *will have* War, &c. Exod. 17. 16. *He owns that the word* Lord *is* Verbum ſuum, *i. e. his Word, in the* Targumiſt: *He adds his Gloſs, let the* Reader *judge of of it,* Decreto Dei, tanquam Perſonæ, tribuit juramentum. *A-*
P. 45, & 46. *gain* (Exod. 20. 7.) *The* Name of the Lord *is, by the* Targumiſt, *expreſſed by* the Name of the Word of the Lord. *Here my Author ſays, that by the Name of God is to be underſtood,* as God revealed himſelf

ſelf in his Word, vel ipſa Lex Dei, *i. e. Or the* very Law of God, by which they were wont to ſwear. *And refers us to* Gen. 21. 23. P. 38. *On which Place my Author (to give him his due) by* WORD, *which is uſed by the* Chaldee, *diſowns that he means the* written Word; *and* P. 229. *yet in another Place, where he reſumes that Text, he urgeth his Adverſary with the Cuſtom of the* Jews, *of ſwearing by the Law of* Moſes, *which is the* written Word: *The* Reader *will judge with what Sincerity he does it.*

He might have ſpared much of his Pains in ſeveral Places. I ſhall take notice of ſome Particulars under this Head.

1. *He endeavours to prove, that* P. 17. *St.* John *did not borrow his* Λογος *from the* Chaldee Paraphraſts. *I will readily grant this. It is enough to us that St.* John *ſpeaks agree-*

agreeably to the Manner of ſpeaking uſed by the Ancient Hebrews; *and that* Philo *as well as the* Targumiſts *ſpeaks in the ſame Style.*

P. 17, 18, &c. 2. *He might have ſpared the pains which he takes in inquiring into the Age of the* Targumiſts; *we are very little concerned in a nice Inquiry into that Matter. Our Cauſe does not depend upon it. That they are very Ancient (I ſpeak of* Onkelos *and* Jonathan *on the Prophets) cannot reaſonably be denied; and, 'tis well known, they are much eſteemed by the* Jews. *The Author of* Bilibra *affirms, that his Adverſaries pretended that St.* John *borrowed his* Λόγος *from them. This is ſome Excuſe for him, if this be admitted to be true. But then, I believe, nothing can excuſe his way*

P. 24. *of proceeding in this Inquiry. He would have us believe that the* Targumiſts *are later than the* Talmud, *becauſe*

becauſe the former borrow from the latter: This he affirms, but could never be able to prove. It is ſo far from being true, that it is apparently falſe. The Author of the Miſna *mentions the* Targum *as uſed in the Synagogue. But the Author of* Bilibra *takes notice of ſeveral things in the* Targumiſts *which are likewiſe in the* Talmud. *But this is far from being any kind of proof: For the* Talmudiſts *might borrow them from the* Targumiſts, *and not the* Targumiſts *from them. At this rate he might prove the New Teſtament more Ancient than the Old, becauſe in the New Teſtament many things are ſaid which are found in the Old. If he had ſpoken to the purpoſe, he ſhould have produced ſome Places in the* Targums *alledged out of the* Talmud: *But in the Method which he takes, he does but* impoſe *upon his* Reader, *and*

Megillah C. 4. M. 10.

expoſe *himſelf.* *St.* Paul *mentions* Jannes *and* Jambres: *Can we thence conclude that he received thoſe Names from* Jonathan *the* Targumiſt, *who hath them? If he did, then is that* Targumiſt *much older than the* Talmud. *But there is no need to aſſum this. It is enough that St.* Paul *and that* Targumiſt *had thoſe Names from the Tradition of the* Jewiſh *Synagogue. This bears hard upon my Author. If his way of reaſoning be allowed, he will be found to prove too much: For by his Method I may prove the* Targumiſt *to be as old as St.* Paul; *when he would prove him, by the ſame reaſoning, later than the* Talmud.

3. *This Author takes a great deal of pains to prove that the* Jews, *(and it appears that he means the* later Jews) *do not believe our Doctrine of the Trinity, but are ſworn Ene-*

Enemies to it. I know no way of excuſing this impertinent Digreſſion of his. He might have ſpared all this Trouble, if he had pleaſed, which yet he ſpends ſeveral Pages about. He quotes Maimon, Abravenel, Lipman, *and* Joſ. Albo; *and, doubtleſs, he might eaſily have quoted many more. But all this is to no manner of purpoſe. Beſides that his Quotations do not prove that theſe* Jews *were ſworn Enemies to our Trinity. But I will allow them ſo to be: I cannot ſtill divine to what purpoſe he takes this pains.* From p. 102, to p. 107.

I take no pleaſure in following this Author, much leſs in expoſing him. Yet becauſe, perhaps, ſome may be ſo weak as to cry him up (I hope there are but few ſuch) I will not think much to follow him farther yet. He tells us that for the Eaſe of his Reader *he will lay before him the various Signifi-* p. 193.

cations of Memra Jehovæ *among the* Targumiſts; *and to that purpoſe he promiſeth to lay before the* Reader *all the Places where that Phraſe occurs in the* Targum *of* Jonathan, Quia ejus præcipuè habetur ratio; utpote authoritate atque antiquitate Onkeloſo & Hieroſolymitano potioris, *i. e.* Becauſe the *Targum* of *Jonathan* is of greateſt regard, as being of greater Authority and Antiquity than that of *Onkelos* and the *Jeruſalem. Surely this Author muſt have a very mean Opinion of his* Reader, *whatever he had of himſelf, when he affirmed this. I ſhall examine the Truth of what he affirms when he ſays that* Jonathan's Targum *on the* Pentateuch *is of the greateſt Authority and Antiquity. Thoſe Men that underſtand theſe Matters would not have ſaid it, but rather have ſuſpected that this Author*

thor had never read the Targums *himſelf, after all the Pother and Noiſe he makes about them. I will examine this Matter, and doubt not but to make it appear that what he affirms is notoriouſly falſe.*

I will not trouble the Reader, *nor urge him with Authorities from the greateſt Men in this kind of Learning that the Church hath had. The Teſtimony of Learned Men will ſignifie little with our Author, and therefore I will forbear.*

Nor will I trouble my ſelf as to the Jeruſalem Targum *upon the* Pentateuch. *I muſt needs ſay that I have no great Opinion of the Antiquity of it; and yet, for what I know, it may in that Matter vye with that which goes under the Name of* Jonathan. *I ſhall ſhew that it ought not to have the ſame Authority, nor is of the ſame Antiquity, with* Onkelos; *and, I may add,*

with that of the true Jonathan *on the Prophets. And,*

1. *This appears from the Style. That of* Onkelos *is Biblical, and Terſe. It comes near to that part of* Daniel *which is written in the* Chaldee *Language; and that of* Jonathan *on the Prophets is like it: But that of* Jonathan *on the* Pentateuch *is a Style that is courſe, and dreggy, novel and vulgar, very flat and low. Any Man of tolerable Judgment will be ſoon convinced of the Truth of this, if he will be at the pains to read them over and compare them. I was abundantly convinced of this many Years ago, when I read them; and I am ſure I could not at that time lie under any Prejudice as to this Matter.*

2. *If we conſider him as a Paraphraſt, we ſhall be farther convinced.* Onkelos, *upon the main, is a ſtrict* Ver-

Verſion; and the true Jonathan *on the Prophets, keeps generally very cloſe to the* Hebrew *Text. He ſeldom adds much; and where he does add, generally ſpeaking, it is for the Illuſtration of the Text. I might give large Proofs of this, were it needfull. But for* Jonathan *on the* Pentateuch, *it is quite otherwiſe. I will paſs by all the Fabulous Relations, which I find a late Writer hath collected, about the Moon's Diminution, and the Monſtrous* Leviathan, *&c. I ſhall refer the* Reader *to ſome few other Additions, out of a vaſt Number which I could produce. The curious* Reader *may conſult him on* Gen. *Chap.* 1. *v.* 14, 26. *Ch.* 2. *v.* 21. *Ch.* 6. *v.* 2. *Ch.* 14. *v.* 18. *Ch.* 16. *v.* 1. *Ch.* 18. *v.* 2. *Ch.* 19. *v.* 24. *Ch.* 25. *v.* 25. *Ch.* 30. *v.* 32. *Ch.* 33. *v.* 4. *Ch.* 49. *v.* 3, 27. Exod. *Ch.* 2. *v.* 12. *Ch.* 15. *v.* 25. *Ch.* 24. *v.* 1, 5. Levit. *Ch.* 14. *v.* 7. *Ch.* 24. *v.* 12.

Ch. 26. v. 44. Numbers *Ch.* 2. v. 3, 10, 18, 25. *Ch.* 16. v. 2, 4. Deut. 32. *v.* 1, 4. *There the* Reader *will be ſatisfied, if he compare this with the true* Jonathan *on the Prophets, that this is not the Manner of the Man. To this I might add the* great *Variations from the* Hebrew *Text, to be found in the Pſeudo-*Jonathan. *Thus* Geneſis *Ch.* 2. *v.* 7. *Inſtead of* Living Soul, *he hath a* Talking Spirit. *Ch.* 9. *v.* 27. Tents *is by him rendred,* School. *Ch.* 14. *v.* 8. Belah, *he renders by a* City that devoureth its Inhabitants. *Ch.* 15. *v.* 11. Fowls, *he expounds by* Idolatrous People. *Ch.* 17. *v.* 3. Fell, *he ſays,* that *Abraham* could not ſtand becauſe he was not circumciſed. *Ch.* 18. *v.* 8. Did eat, *he renders by,* they ſeemed to him to eat. *Ch.* 39. *v.* 6. Bread, *he renders by* Wife. *Exodus* 6. 15. Shaul, *he expounds by* Zimri.

Zimri. *Lev.* 19. *v.* 35. Meaſure, *he expounds by* Dimenſion of Summer and Winter. *Numb.* 22. 5. Balaam, *he expounds by* Laban *the* Syrian. *Deut.* 16.16. Empty, *he expounds by*, void of all the Precepts. *More ſtill, he ſometime contradicts the Text. As on* Gen. 2. 8. *alters the* Hebrew *Number.* Exod. 26.7. *This is very unlike to the true* Jonathan: *And therefore this Author ought not to have an Authority equal to* Onkelos *and the true* Jonathan. *And that he is not of that Antiquity which is pretended, appears,*

3. *From the Book it ſelf, which is the cleareſt Proof in this Caſe. And this will eaſily appear to any Man that will read him over with due Care, and compare him with the other* Targumiſts. *I have ſpoken of his Style already; I ſhall now proceed to other Matters. I wou'd not diſpute with this Author about*

about the Antiquity of the true Jonathan, *who wrote on the Prophets. I take the Caſe to be this. Our Author had met with ſome Books, who told him that* Jonathan *was the oldeſt Paraphraſt, they meaning the true* Jonathan, *who wrote upon the Prophets ; (who hath indeed great Marks of Antiquity.) The* Socinian *ſnatcheth at this, and applies it to this falſe* Jonathan, *becauſe he found a* Targum *that went under his Name: Whereas it does not appear that the true* Jonathan *ever wrote upon the* Pentateuch ; *and if he did, it does evidently appear that he could not write that on the* Pentateuch *which goes under his Name. And to the End this may ſtill more clearly appear, I ſhall make ſome Obſervations from the Book it ſelf.*

We ſhall find in this Jonathan *ſome Words and Expreſſions which forbid us to allow him to be of that An-*

Antiquity or Authority with the true Jonathan. *I do not ſay that the true* Jonathan *hath no Exotick Words in him: I know he hath ſome few that are foreign, or at leaſt reputed ſo by Learned Men. But this Pſeudo-*Jonathan *hath Words and Expreſſions, that could not be uſed by the true* Jonathan. *e.g.* Gen. 32. 6. *We read that* Eſau *came to meet* Jacob *with four hundred* Men. *What* Men *they were, the Text does not ſay: But* Jonathan *calls them* פולטרכין Polemarchi, *or fighting Men. I find no fault with his Paraphraſe: The word* Polemarchin *is of neither* Hebrew *nor* Chaldaick, *but of a* Greek *Extraction and Compoſition. The Novel Writers of the* Jews *are full of ſuch kind of words, and the Reaſon why they are ſo is obvious and plain: But the true* Jonathan *cannot be ſuppoſed to uſe ſuch a word as this for*

fight-

fighting Men, or Men of War. And to this purpose it is to be considered, that the true Jonathan, *especially in his* Targum *upon the first Prophets, hath frequent Occasion of expressing, after his way, what he finds in the* Hebrew *Text that imports* Fighting Men, *or* Men of War. *And we find he does it in* Chaldee *Words of the same Import, as the* Reader *may see that will consult him on* Josh. 5. 4. Ch. 6. *v.* 2. Ch. 8. *v.* 8. 1 Kings 9. 22. Ch. 12. *v.* 21. *These Places he renders by* Chaldee *Words, and that with some Variety; but no where useth* Polemarchin. *This is a clear Evidence that this is not the same Author who wrote upon the* Pentateuch. *We find, he who wrote on the* Pentateuch *useth this Exotick Word in another Place also;* Gen. 33. 1. *Though there was nothing in the* Hebrew *Text that gave him occasion to use it: But*

the

the other Jonathan *useth not this Word when he hath a fair Occasion given him so to do.*

Again, *Exod.* 38. *v.* 8. *What we turn* Looking-glasses, *he renders by an Exotick Word of a* Latin *Original. Again,* Deut. 1. 12. *To what we render* your Cumbrance, *he adds* Epicureism; *a Word which the true* Jonathan *cannot be supposed to use. But I have still farther proofs that this* Jonathan *cannot pretend to the Antiquity allowed to the true* Jonathan; *and to* Onkelos. *e.g.* Exod. *Ch.* 26. *v.* 9. *where there is mention of five Curtains, and of six. This* Jonathan *adds, that* the five were with respect to the five Books of the Law, the six with respect to the six Seders of the Misna. *It seems this* Jonathan *wrote after the* Misna *was compiled, which was about* 200 *Years after* Christ; *and therefore he could not be the Author*

of

of any Targum *mentioned by the* Mišna, *of which I made mention before; and consequently, could not be of principal Authority and Antiquity, as the Author of* Bibbra *would have his* Reader *believe. But I shall prove him still of a later Time than that: For on* Numb. 24. v. 19. *he mentions* Constantinople: *Every Man knows that this he could not have done, had he not lived till* Constantine *had built that City, and given it that Name. I do not deny but that this Paraphrase is, however, of good use. I will say so of* Joseph Ben Gorion: *But then I do not think him fit to be compared for Authority or Antiquity with, the Noble Author,* Flavius Josephus.

P. 153. *A greater Confidence I never met with in any Author. He denies that any* Jew *whatsoever affirms the* Word *of* God *signifies an Eternal and Co-essential Word. I hope he (or his Editor)*

ditor) *will anſwer a late Book againſt the* Unitarians. *They may find ſomething offered in the following Papers out of* Philo, *&c. to the ſame purpoſe: It will be time to anſwer intirely the Author of* Bilibra *when that is done.*

I might here lay before my Reader *all the Places that occur in the true* Jonathan; *where the* Memra *or* Word, *of the Lord is mentioned: But that would be too much in a Preface. I ſhall mention a very few, out of a great Number, where that Expreſſion does neceſſarily denote a Divine Perſon, or God himſelf. The* Reader *may examine the following Places.* 1 Kings 8. 57. Chap. 9. *v.* 7. ch. 12. *v.* 24. ch. 14. *v.* 11. 2 *Kings* 10. 17. ch. 18. *v.* 5, 7. ch. 20. *v.* 6. *Iſa.* ch. 1. 14. ch. 10. *v.* 20. ch. 12. *v.* 2. *Jer.* 1. *v.* 19. ch. 28. *v.* 23. *To the* Word *are attributed the great things predicted*

of

of the Meſſias, *Iſa.* 9. 7. Jehovah *himſelf is expounded by the Lords Chriſt.* Iſa. 28. 5. *This Word of the Lord is called the Redeemer.* Jer. 42. 5. *and his Redemption is called Everlaſting.* Iſa. 45. 17. *And the Creation of the World is imputed to him.* Jer. 27. 5.

I might lay before the Reader *the abſurd Interpretations this Author is forced to give of ſeveral Places, that he may be able to maintain*
P. 31. *his* Hypotheſis. *Where* Repentance *or* Grief *is by the* Chaldee *attributed to the* Word *of* God, *he interpreis it of God's Word or Decree by which he appointed the Creation of Man. The Covenant made between*
P. 33. *Man and the Word of God* (Gen. 17. 2.) *he thus interprets; by Oath and Promiſe on God's Part, and the Condition on Man's; and theſe he makes the two Parties. Where the Word of God is ſaid to be a Witneſs, he*

he is forced (against his own Principle) to expound the Word by God himself, or an Angel; and where the Word of God is said to have given P. 40. *Children,* Gen. 48. 9. *he refers the* Reader *to* Gen. 37. 9. *(I know not to what purpose,) or else he says it is so said, because the Word of the Lord was the Cause of this Blessing. Thus I have given the* Reader *a little Taste of the Abilities of this Author, and as much as a PREFACE can well bear.* P. 41.

I must own that I have from my Youth had a mighty Veneration for the Chaldee *Paraphrasts, and think them, next to the Sacred Text, one of the choicest Treasures that the Learned* Christians *do enjoy. They are of marvellous use to us in our Disputes against the* Jews, *not to say* Socinians *also. It were no hard matter to shew the various and vast Usefulness and Advantages we may re-*

ceive by them. But this would require a Treatiſe by it ſelf. I have always thought we were obliged to bleſs God for ſuch a Treaſure. But far be it from me to think them all of equal Value and Antiquity. I grant the Pſeudo Jonathan *of much leſs Authority and Antiquity than ſome of them. The Man that advanceth* him *muſt mightily depreciate the* other. *How far this may ſerve the* Socinian's *Cauſe I know not; I am ſure 'tis great Diſſervice to* Chriſtianity: *And therefore I hope the* Reader *will bear with the foregoing Digreſſion.*

For the Tenth Chapter, *in this following* Part, *which treats of the* Falſe Chriſts, *the* Reader *might have expected a fuller Account: And he ſhould have had it. But ſo it was,* that *would have required ſome Books which I had not by me. And though I endeavoured to procure*

cure them from beyond the Seas (as my Friends know) or procure the Loan of them here, yet I was not ſucceſsfull in it. This I mention for this Reaſon only, that the Reader *may be informed for what Reaſon he hath not a fuller Account of that Matter.*

I have, in the following Diſcourſe with the Jews, *given their Arguments their full force, and uſed them with that Humanity that I ought to do. I heartily pray to God for their Converſion, and would be glad to do any thing that might contribute to it. And if it ſhould at any time happen, that what I have offered ſhould gain any of them to the* Chriſtian *Faith, it would be to me a greater Joy than to have gained all the Wealth of the* Indies.

This I muſt needs ſay, that the more I conſider the Grounds of the Chriſtian *Religion the more I like them.*

them. It ſtands upon a ſure Bottom, and does not fear the moſt ſubtle Arguments that can be brought againſt it. It will never fall that way. I heartily wiſh our Lives were anſwerable to our Principles. I think nothing threatens us ſo much as the general Decay of Piety, and Rampancy of Vice and Immorality, and our own Voluntary forſaking that Faith which was once delivered to the Saints. *I have nothing farther to detain the* Reader *with, but to deſire his Prayers to Almighty God that he would ſucceed this honeſt Endeavour, that it may gain the End for which it is intended.*

THE

THE CONTENTS

Of the several Chapters

Contain'd in this Book.

CHAP. I.

The Plea of the Jews *for the* Perpetuity *of the Law of* Moses. *The State of this Question between* Christians *and* Jews. *Several Arguments to prove that the Law of* Moses *is not of perpetual Obligation. An Explication of* Haggai 2. ver. 6. *A particular Consideration of the* Jews *Pretences. That the Constitutions of* Moses *are said to be* Ordinances for ever. *Deut.* 4. 2. *consider'd. Of the* Psalmist's *magnifying the Law of* Moses. *A Discourse upon* Malachy *ch.* 4. ver. 4. Deut. 33. 4. *consider'd. A particular Consideration of our* Saviour's *Words,*

Matt. 5. *verſ.* 17, 18. *In what Sence* Jeſus *ſays, he* did not come to deſtroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil. *Luke* 16. 29. *conſider'd. A Diſcourſe on* Rom. 3. *verſ.* 31. Page 1, 2

CHAP. II.

Prophecies of the Peaceable *Time of the* Meſſias. *The* Jews *affirm that theſe are not fulfilled in the Days of* Jeſus. *They alſo alledge the Words of* Jeſus, *Matth.* 10. 34. Jeſus *and his Religion defended againſt this Charge. The Import of the foregoing Prophecies. How far thoſe Prophecies have been fulfilled already. What ground we have to believe that thoſe Prophecies will be farther fulfill'd. Dan.* 2. 44. *conſidered, as alſo* Dan. 7. Matth. 10. 34. *conſidered at large and compared with a parallel Place,* Luke 12. 5. p. 40

CHAP. III.

A Defence of the Writers of the New Teſtament againſt ſome other Objections of J. Aben-Ammam. *His Objection againſt* Matth. 12. 3, 4. *anſwered. An Anſwer to his Objection againſt* Luke 4. 25. *His Objection againſt the Words of* Jeſus *in*

Mark 10. 19. *An Answer to that Objection. An Objection against* Jesus *for destroying the Herd of Swine*, Mat. 8. *v.* 32. *an Answer to it. The* Jews *Objections against* Jesus *for not making good his Promise*, Matt. 26. 32. *and against the Credibility of the History of his Ascension. An Answer to these Objections. The* Jews *Objections against the Words of* Jesus, *John* ch. 16. *v.* 7. *and* v. 13. *An Answer to those Objections. His Objections against the Evangelists relating our Saviour's keeping the Passeover just before his Death. The* Jew *pretends that the Relation is inconsistent and incredible: An Answer at large to the* Jews *Pretences. His Objection against the Relation of* Pilate's *washing his Hands, answered. An Answer to his Objection concerning the Weight of the* Myrrh *and* Aloes, *John* 19. v. 39. *An Answer to his Objection against* Matth. 28. 18. *His Objection against* John *ch.* 21. v. 25. *A Defence of that Evangelist against the* Jew's *Assaults. The* Jew *objects against the Words of St.* Paul, *Gal.* ch. 3. *v.* 10. *A Defence of St.* Paul. *He objects against the Author of the Epistle to the* Hebrews, *for those words which are found*, ch. 9. *v.* 19. *A Defence of that Divine Author. His Objection against the Epi-*

ſtle of St. James. *An Anſwer to his Objection.* p. 76, 77

CHAP. IV.

B. Trans

That the Chriſtian's *Doctrine of the* H. Trinity *is no ſufficient Bar to the* Jew's *embracing the* Chriſtian *Religion. What the New Teſtament teacheth us concerning the* H. Trinity. *The* Jews *pretend that this Doctrine is abſurd and againſt Reaſon, and that it infers Tritheiſm, or a Plurality of Gods. Theſe pretences conſidered. They alſo object that the* Chriſtian's *Doctrine is againſt the Law of* Moſes, *and the Old Teſtament: in anſwer whereunto it is granted that this Doctrine is not clearly revealed in the Old Teſtament; but there are intimations of it there. Several places produced to ſhew that there are in the Old Teſtament intimations of ſome kind of Plurality in the Divine Nature; and more particularly of the Trinity. This ſhewed from the* Jewiſh *Writers. A Teſtimony to this purpoſe from* R. Bechai. *Several other Teſtimonies from the* Rabian. *Of God's creating Man, as 'tis related,* Gen. 1. Pſ. 50. v. 1. *conſidered, with a place quoted from* Midraſh Tillim. *Iſa.* ch. 6. v. 3. *with ſome Teſtimonies related by* P. Galatinus.

Numb.

Numb. ch. 6. *v.* 24, &c. *conſidered, with ſeveral Teſtimonies from the* Hebrew *Doctors.* Deut. 6. *v.* 4. *conſidered. How thoſe words may be tranſlated. Another Teſtimony out of* Zohar *from a* Jewiſh *Writer. Some Objections againſt what hath been ſaid,* viz. [1] Abravenel's, *that* Elohim *is of the ſingular Number. An Anſwer thereto.* [2] *The pretence that the plural* Elohim *is uſed from the Cuſtom of ſpeaking that obtained among the Idolatrous* Canaanites. *An Anſwer at large to that pretenſion.* [3] *A pretence that the Plural is uſed according to the Cuſtom of Kings, who ſpeak of themſelves after the ſame Manner. An Anſwer to this pretenſion.* [4] *An Objection mentioned by* Abeu Ezra *on* Gen. 1. *v.* 26. *but diſapproved by him alſo. An Anſwer to it. A Reflection upon paſſages quoted out of the* Bereſhith Rabba *relating to this Matter. Several places quoted from the* Apocryphal *Books, to prove that the Ancient* Jews *own'd ſome kind of Plurality in the Divine Nature; and that there were among them ſome intimations of the* H. Trinity. p. 158, 159

The CONTENTS.

CHAP. V.

The Teſtimony of Philo *the* Jew, *concerning the* H. Trinity, *and the* λόγος. *A Fragment of his out of* Euſebius, *with a Reflection upon it. His Account of the Cherubims and flaming Sword. Its agreeableneſs to the Sacred Writers. A Paſſage of* Origen *to the ſame purpoſe. His Account of the three Perſons mentioned,* Gen. 18. *Some Reflections upon that Account with relation to the* Chriſtian's *Account of the* H. Trinity. *Some other Places out of* Philo *the* Jew *to the ſame purpoſe, with Reflections upon them. The Account which* Philo *gives of the* λόγος. *He makes the* Manna *a Symbol of the* λόγος. *He ſpeaks in this agreeably to the other* Jewiſh *Writers, and to what we read in the New Teſtament.* Philo *owns the* λόγος *to be the Governour of the World, the Son of God, and that he was begotten Eternally, and that he is* NECESSARILY *immortal. The Rows of precious Stones on* Aaron's *Breſt-plate a Symbol of the* λόγος. *A very remarkable Place of* Philo *to that purpoſe. The* λόγος *conſidered by* Philo *as an Advocate. That the* λόγος *cannot be*

be a Creature is ſhewn from another Paſſage in Philo. *He calls the* λόγος *the* Angel *mentioned*, Exod. 23. v. 23. *and the true High-Prieſt. He affirms the* Levitical *High-Prieſt to be a Type or Symbol of the* λόγος. *He expounds theſe words*, Zech. 6. 12. Behold the Man whoſe Name is the BRANCH, *of the* λόγος. *He affirms him to be the Mediator between God and Man; To be not Unbegotten as the Father, and not Begotten as Men. The Subſtance of* Philo's *Evidence ſummed up. The* Chaldee *Paraphraſis conſidered in this Matter. They ſpeak of the* λόγος *as of a Divine Perſon. Several Teſtimonies to this purpoſe out of* Onkelos, *and from the Paraphraſe of* Jonathan, *and that of* Jeruſalem. *An Objection of an* Anti-trinitarian: *An Anſwer* to that Objection. *Of the* Shechinah. p. 198, 199

CHAP. VI.

Some Objections *againſt what hath been ſaid before.* (1) *It is* objected *againſt* Philo *that he was a* Platoniſt, *and that he learned what he ſaid on this Argument from* Plato. *An Anſwer to this* Objection. *It does not appear that* Philo *learnt*

his Doctrine from Plato. *That it is very credible that* Plato *received his Doctrine in these Matters from the* Jewish *Books, or* Jewish Kabbala. *Testimonies of many of the* Ancients *to this purpose. It will be hard to give any other Account of the Principles of* Plato. *That other* Jewish *Writers agree with* Philo. Objection (2) *That this is a Novel Doctrine. An Answer to this Objection. A very remarkable Passage out of* Theodoret *to this purpose. Some Reflections on that Passage. The* Heathens *had some knowledge of the* Trinity, *and* λόγος. *That they received many things from the* Jews. *The Original of several People best known from* Moses. *Hence the Fables of the* Heathen *had their ground. The Story of* Saturn *was derived from that Account which* Moses *gives of* Noah: *This appears from a great many Correspondencies. A more particular Account of them. The Sons of* Saturn *in the* Heathen *Mythology the same with these of* Noah. Jupiter *answered to* Ham. *He was* Ammon: *Of* Amon-No. *Jerem.* 46. 25. *explained*; Neptune *the same with* Japhet. *The Congruity between the History of* Moses, *and the* Heathen *Mythology, considered.* Pluto *the same with* Shem.

Plato

Plato *is observed to borrow from* Moſes, *or the* Jewiſh Kabbala: *A clear proof of this from his* Convivium, *or the Speech of* Ariſtophanes; *its Conformity to the Text of* Moſes, *and the* Jewiſh Kabbala. *What the Ancient* Heathen *have ſaid concerning the* λόγος *and* Trinity. *Of the* Mithras τετρλάσιος *among the* Perſians. *Some paſſages from the* Chaldee *Oracles; The Teſtimony of* Orpheus, *and* Epicharmus, *concerning the* λόγος. *Footſteps of the* Trinity *in the* Egyptian *Theology. Of* Plato's *Doctrine of the* Trinity. *The great uſefulneſs of theſe Teſtimonies from the* Heathens *to our common* Chriſtianity *ſhewed in ſundry particulars.* p. 244, 245

CHAP. VII.

Of the Time within which the Meſſias *was to come. The* Jews *are uneaſie in this Controverſie. That the Time is paſt. This proved from* Gen. 49. 10. *The Ancient* Jews *own that place to relate to* Meſſias. *That it is very agreeably expounded to that purpoſe. The great care to keep the Tribe of* Juda *diſtinct. They were numbred by themſelves.* Juda *gave denomination to the* Jews. *A Teſtimony from* Abravenel. Benjamin *an acceſſory to*

to this Tribe. The true Religion and Worſhip of God preſerved in it. Prieſts *and* Levites *preſerved in it. They had alſo Teachers of the Law, and ſome Rulers in our Saviour's Time. A Teſtimony from* R. David Gantz: *Another from* Joſephus. *Out of this Tribe* Meſſias *was to ariſe. That by Scepter* Jacob *does not mean Kingly Power. We do not produce* Gen. 49. 10. *as a direct proof that* Jeſus *is the* Chriſt: *The later* Jews *pretenſions againſt the* Chriſtians *Interpretation.* M. Ben-Iſrael's *Attempts. The Reaſon why I do not think fit to conſider them particularly.* J. Aben-Amram *conſidered fully. His Reflections on the* Latin *Verſion, conſidered. His firſt conſiderable Expoſition examined, and ſhewed to be inconſiſtent. His* ſecond *conſiderable Opinion, being that of* Abravenel. *The* Jews *have no Juriſdiction or Dominion at this time. Teſtimonies from* Abravenel *and* M. B. Iſrael *to this purpoſe. That the* Meſſias *was not to be a Temporal Prince. The vain Attempts of the* Jew *upon* עד כי Gen. 49. 10. *That thoſe Particles are not to be ſeparated. The Authority of* Onkelos *conſidered in this Matter. That the Expoſition of* Onkelos *does neither hurt the* Chriſtians, *nor help the* Jews. *The pretence that*

that Jeſus *was not born in the latter Days, as was foretold of the* Meſſias: *The Reader referred for an Anſwer to that pretence in its proper place. The* Jew *leaves his Reader to believe* R. Sueb *and* Abravenel *alſo, if he think fit.* p. 292, 293

CHAP. VIII.

That the Meſſias *is come is proved from* Haggai *ch.* 2. *verſe* 6, 7, &c. *The occaſion of thoſe words. Of the* Deſire of all Nations. *Of the* greater Glory *of the* Second Temple. *What Accounts the* Jews *give of that Matter. The Vanity of what they offer upon that occaſion. A Pretence that this* latter Houſe *is not to be meant of the* Second Temple: Abravenel *is juſtly expoſed for advancing an Obſervation to that purpoſe. Several Arguments to prove that the* Latter Houſe *is to be underſtood of the* Second Temple. *Some Pretences of* J. Aben-Amram *conſidered. His* Firſt *Pretence, with an Anſwer thereunto. An Anſwer to his* Second *Pretence. An Anſwer to his* Third, Fourth, Fifth, *and* Sixth. *The Interpretation of* J. Aben-Amram *upon the words of the Prophet.*

The

The Vanity of his Interpretation shewed in several particulars. p. 336

CHAP. IX.

The Promise of the Messias *is* absolute, *not* conditional. *The* Jews *give up their Cause when they deny this. The* Messias *was promised as a great Blessing to the* Gentiles. *There is no Condition annexed to the Promise of the Coming of* Messias. *The Time is fixed within which he was to come. The Impenitence of the* Jews *could not hinder his coming. That the coming of* Messias *is a fundamental Article of the* Jewish *Faith; and therefore the Promise cannot be conditional. An Enquiry for what Sins of the* Jews *they can pretend that the Coming of* Messias *is delayed. That the* Jews, *in this Matter, are inconsistent with themselves. The* Jews *are not all of a Mind in this Question. Of the different Case of the Prophets who foretold* Good, *from that of them who foretold* Evil. *Of the* last Days, *in which the* Messias *was to come. In what Terms the* Days (*or Time*) *of the* Messias *are expressed by the Ancient* Hebrews: *How it is expressed by the* Chaldee *Paraphrasts, and how by the Writers*

ters of the New Testament. Of the true Sence and Importance of the last Days, *when applied to the Time of the* Messias. *They are the same with the* World to come; *and that to be explained with reference to the* Jewish *Polity. Times, in Holy Writ, are divided with regard to the* Church, *or to the World. With respect to the* Church *they are to be considered as* before *and* under *the* Law; *and under the* Messias. *Times with respect to this* World *are reckoned by the* four Kingdoms *in* Daniel. *This may be called the greater* Kalendar. *Of the less or provincial* Kalendar *in* Daniel. *That the* Jews *have no Cause to object against the Time in which* Jesus *did appear. That the Time in which* Jesus *appeared was the same with the* last Days; *both with respect to the* Jewish *Church, or* Mosaick *Oeconomy, as also with respect to the four great* Kingdoms *in* Daniel. p. 363, 364

CHAP. X.

An Historical Account of the false Christs *that have appeared since our Saviour's Time in the several Ages, according to the Prediction of* Jesus, *John* 5. 43. *The History*

Hiſtory of Bar Cochab: *An Account of* Moſes Cretenſis, *and* Dunaan, *and* Julian: *Of* Mahomet, *and a* Syrian *Impoſtor, and another in* France. *Of another that appeared in* Perſia, *A. D.* 1138, *and another, in the ſame Century, who appeared at* Corduba *in* Spain: *Of one, mentioned by* Maimon, *in the Kingdom of* Fez; *as alſo one in* Arabia, *and another beyond* Euphrates. *Another diſturbs* Perſia: *Another ariſes in* Moravia: *Another mentioned by the Author of* Shevet Jehuda. *An Account of* David el David. *Of ſeveral others that appeared in* Spain, Germany, *and* Eaſt-India. *A more particular Account of* Sabatai Sevi. *Of* R. Mordecai. *The Uſefulneſs of this Account in ſeveral Particulars: To which is added an Account of the Deſtruction and Extirpation of the* Jews *out of the Empire of* Perſia. *The Relation of* Antonius Montezinus *made to* M. B. Iſrael, *concerning the* Ten Tribes. *The ſtreſs which* M. B. Iſrael *laid upon it. The great Vanity thereof. The great Variety of Opinions among the* Jews, *concerning the Coming of* Meſſias; *and their Inconſiſtence.* p. 389, 390

CHAP.

The CONTENTS.

CHAP. XI.

What it was which diverted me from treating of the general Converſion of the Jewiſh *Nation. What Methods are to be avoided by thoſe who attempt to convert any of them*; viz. *Compulſion or Force*; *profeſſing any thing that is againſt ſound Reaſon*; *weak Arguments, and ill Words. A ſhort Account of the preſent Condition of the* Jews. *What* Chriſtian *Princes and States may do towards the Converſion of the* Jews: *The* Jews *may be obliged to hear our Sermons, and ſubmit to Conferences: They ought not to uſe what Prayers in their Synagogues they pleaſe: They ought not to be injured, but kept low: They may be obliged to give the Government their Reaſons why they reject Chriſtianity: Of ſome other Matters that may be taken Care of by the Government. What may be done this way by others. What may be done by the Univerſities, and what by Men of Eſtates, and Men of Learning. Of the beſt way of proceeding with them in ſundry Particulars. Mean Men may do ſomething this way. That the Queſtions agitated between the* Jews *and* Chriſtians *are things of the higheſt*

highest importance. That the Jews, *of all Men in the World, are the most considerable Enemies of the* Christian *Religion. The great Advantages of gaining them to the* Christian *Faith. Some* Objections *against attempting to convert them.* Obj. 1. *That it will be lost Labour. An Answer to it.* Obj. 2. *That it will bring many Poor upon us. An Answer to it.* Obj. 3. *That the Converts from them are generally scandalous and insincere. An Answer to that* Objection. *The Conclusion.* p. 443, 444

A

A DEMONSTRATION OF THE MESSIAS.

PART III.

CHAP. I.

The CONTENTS.

The Plea of the Jews *for the* Perpetuity *of the Law of* Moſes. *The State of this Queſtion between* Chriſtians *and* Jews. *Several Arguments to prove that the Law of* Moſes *is not of perpetual Obligation. An Explication of* Haggai 2. ver. 6. *A particular Conſideration of the* Jews *Pretences. That the Conſtitutions of* Moſes *are ſaid to be* Ordinances for ever. *Deut.* 4. 2. *conſider'd. Of the* Pſal-

highest importance. That the Jews, *of all Men in the World, are the most considerable Enemies of the* Christian *Religion. The great Advantages of gaining them to the* Christian *Faith. Some* Objections *against attempting to convert them.* Obj. 1. *That it will be lost Labour. An Answer to it.* Obj. 2. *That it will bring many Poor upon us. An Answer to it.* Obj. 3. *That the Converts from them are generally scandalous and insincere. An Answer to that* Objection. *The Conclusion.* p. 443, 444

A DEMONSTRATION OF THE MESSIAS.

PART III.

CHAP. I.

The CONTENTS.

The Plea of the Jews *for the* Perpetuity *of the Law of* Moſes. *The State of this Queſtion between* Chriſtians *and* Jews. *Several Arguments to prove that the Law of* Moſes *is not of perpetual Obligation. An Explication of* Haggai 2. ver. 6. *A particular Conſideration of the* Jews *Pretences. That the Conſtitutions of* Moſes *are ſaid to be* Ordinances for ever. *Deut.* 4. 2. *conſider'd. Of the* Pſalmiſt's

miſt's *magnifying the Law of* Moſes. *A Diſcourſe upon* Malachy ch. 4. ver. 4. Deut. 33. 4. *Conſider'd. A particular Conſideration of our* Saviour's *words*, Matt. 5. ver. 17, 18. *In what Sence* Jeſus *ſays, he* did not come to deſtroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil. Luk. 16. 29. *conſider'd. A Diſcourſe on* Rom 3. ver. 31.

ANOTHER great Pretence of the *Jews*, and prejudice againſt *Chriſtianity*, ariſeth from an Opinion, which they hold pertinaciouſly, that the Law of *Moſes* is of *perpetual* Obligation: Nor can it be denied that this Pretence is ſpecious, and the *Jews* have ſomething to urge in this matter. I will be ſo far from conceal'ing any thing which they have to ſay. That I will produce what I have met with in their Books to this Purpoſe, and ſhew it to the beſt advantage of their Cau e.

J. Albo Ikkarim Par. I. c. 17. *Portalitizam fidei* lib. 3.

It is on all hands agreed, that this Law came from God; and as it was with great Solemnity delivered at Mount *Sinai*, ſo it was confirmed by Miracles; and being therefore of unqueſtionable Truth, it is but reaſonable to believe, that it is of perpetual Obligation, and, like the Author of it, perfect and unchangeable. And to this

this Purpoſe the *Jews* may, and they do urge many things to prove their Law of perpetual Obligation. *E. G.* That thoſe Laws, when they were firſt given, were not given for that preſent Seaſon and occaſion only, but delivered as Statutes and Ordinances *for ever*; that, as an Argument of the Perfection of that Law, it was provided that nothing ſhould be *added* to it, or *taken* from it; that the devout *Pſalmiſt* ſays of it ſuch great things as ſpeak it to be unchangeable; that as the *Jews* proſpered when they did obey it, ſo all the Miſeries which overtook them, came upon them for their Diſobedience to that Law; that upon the ceaſing of the Spirit of Prophecy in *Iſrael*, and in the very Cloſe of the Canon of Scripture, they are put in mind to adhere to the Law of *Moſes*; *Remember ye the law of Moſes my ſervant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb, for all Iſrael, with the Statutes and Judgments.* (Mal. 4. 4.) By which words the *Jews* were obliged not only to obey the *Moral* Precepts, but the *poſitive* ones, called the *Statutes* and *Judgments*; this whole Law was given for all *Iſrael*, and not only to them who were preſent at the Solemn Delivery of it in the Wilderneſs, but for their Seed and Poſterity for ever; hence it is, that the Law is called *the inheritance*

R. Iſaac Chizzuk Emuna, l. 1. c. 17.

MS. Luſitan. n. 156. &c. *heritance* of the Congregation of *Jacob.* (*Deut.* 33. 4.) To what hath been ſaid, the *Jews* urge that *Jeſus* himſelf affirmed, that he did *not come to deſtroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil:* And *that till Heaven and Earth paſs, one jot or one tittle ſhall in no wiſe paſs from the Law till all be fulfilled.* (Matt. 5. 17, 18.) That theſe words of *Jeſus* were agreeable with his Practice; when he cured the *Leper,* MS. L. n. 137, 138. he ſent him to the *Prieſt* to make his Oblation; and when he did eat the Paſſover he obſerved the Legal Cuſtom; he bid his Followers pray, that their flight might not be on the *Sabbath,* ſo great was his Veneration for that Inſtitution: The Apoſtles in the firſt Council forbad Blood, &c. And the miſerable Man in the Parable, when he pleaded for his Brethren, MS. L. n. 161, & 162. was told they had *Moſes* and the *Prophets*; and St. *Paul,* ſays he, is ſo far from *making void the Law by Faith,* that he ſays, *Yea we eſtabliſh the Law,* (Rom. 3. 31.) And St. *Paul* elſewhere affirms, that the *Law is good*: In a word, the Law was given for the Poſterity of *Iſrael* (Deut. 29. 14.) And we find God declaring himſelf to this Purpoſe by his Prophet, ſaying, *This is my Covenant with them, ſaith the Lord, my Spirit that is upon thee, and my words that I have put in thy mouth, ſhall not*

not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy Seed, nor out of the mouth of thy Seeds Seed, ſaith the Lord, from hence forth, and for ever. (Iſa. 59. 21.)

For my better proceeding in this weighty Argument, I ſhall make uſe of the following method.

Firſt, I ſhall ſtate the Queſtion between the *Chriſtians* and *Jews*, concerning the Perpetuity of the Law of *Moſes*.

Secondly, I ſhall prove againſt the *Jews*, that the Law of *Moſes* is not of perpetual Obligation.

Thirdly, I ſhall anſwer the Pretences of the *Jews* produced above.

I. I ſhall State the Queſtion between the *Chriſtians* and *Jews*, concerning the Perpetuity of the Law of *Moſes*.

The Laws given by *Moſes* were of ſeveral kinds. Some were *Moral*, which do oblige for ever. Of this there is no Diſpute between *Chriſtians* and *Jews*. Some of theſe Laws of *Moſes* were *Poſitive* Inſtitutions; and theſe were of two ſorts: Some were *Ritual* and Ceremonial, or the Laws of the *Jews* conſidered as a *Church*; ſuch were the Laws about Sacrifices, Purifications, *&c.* Others were *Political*, or *Civil*, as the *Jews* were conſidered as a *Commonwealth*, Civil Society or

Polity; such were the Laws about Servitude, Damages, Punishments, &c. The Question between the *Christians* and *Jews* is concerning these *Positive* Institutions.

II. That these Laws are not of perpetual Obligation I shall prove, from the following Arguments, against the *Jews*.

1. Because these Laws are not good in themselves: They are not antecedently so; our Obligation to such Laws ariseth only from positive Institution. They are at best but *Ritual*, or *Types* of some better thing; or else *Constitutions* that are barely *Civil* and *Political*, and consequently alterable upon occasion. *I gave them also Statutes that were not good, and Judgments whereby they should not live.* (Ezek. 20. 25.) These things did not perfect humane Nature, nor form in Mankind a Divine Temper and Likeness. Men might be very good without these Laws, and very bad when they obeyed them.

The World was two thousand years old before the Law was given by *Moses*, and in that space of time there were great Examples of Piety and Vertue; there were those then who pleased God, and yet were not Circumcised. Thus *Justin Martyr*, discoursing of the *Jewish* Circumcision, says very well, that we need it not.

J. Martyr Dialog. cum Tryphon.

'E

Ἐπεὶ γὰρ, &c. *For* (ſays he) *if that were neceſſary, as ye ſuppoſe, God would not have created* Adam *having on his fore-skin, nor have regarded the Oblation of uncircumciſed* Abel. *nor had* Enoch *pleaſed him and been tranſlated. Uncircumciſed* Lot *was ſaved from* Sodom *by the Miniſtry of Angels.* Noah *with his Sons went uncircumciſed into the Ark:* Melchizedek *the Prieſt of the moſt high God, to whom* Abraham *paid Tythe, and from whom he received a Bleſſing, was uncircumciſed: And yet God promiſeth a Prieſt for ever according to the Order of* Melchizedek.

It is a fooliſh Opinion, to think the Forms of Worſhip unalterable, or that God deſigned them for ever; for he declares frequently, that Sacrifices and other Rites were not in themſelves pleaſing to him; that he preferred *Mercy* before *Sacrifice*, and a penitent and broken Heart, before any other Oblation.

2. The ſe Laws were never intended for all the World; they were given to *one People*, and many of them annexed and reſtrained to one *certain Land*, and ſome of them to a certain *Place* of that Land, and a *certain* Tabernacle or *Temple* ſituated in that Place. Some Precepts which we find in the Books of *Moſes*, were ſo *Temporary*, that they obliged them to whom they were given

for that time only, and not for the time to come. These the *Jews* call סגוית שעה, i. e. *Occasional Precepts:* Such in *Egypt* were several Rites relating to the first Passover, *viz.* Eating it with Staves in their hands, *&c.* which did not oblige in after times. Such in the *Wilderness* were several Precepts; *e. g.* The setting by a Pot of *Manna*, the not molesting *Moab* and *Ammon*, that of making the *Brazen Serpent*, the bringing the Blood of every slain Beast to the Door of the Tabernacle: Such at the first *Entrance* into the *Land*, were the Precepts of the Blessings and Curses in *Gerizim*, &c. Other of these Precepts of *Moses* were to endure to after Ages, these Precepts the *Jews* call Precepts לדורות for *Generations*, or, for after times. Of this matter I shall have occasion to speak more afterwards. In the mean time it is to be observed, That 'tis added to these Precepts, that they must be observed in *their Generations*, and in *their Land*; which two Limitations are very restrictive, and do abundantly declare that these are Precepts which do not concern Mankind, and consequently are not of perpetual Obligation.

P. Mart. Sepher Mizvoth.

Gen. 49. 10. Psal. 2. 8. Isa. 2. 2. 11. 10. 14. 1. 49. 6. &c. 3. 5.

3. God doth in the Old Testament declare often, that he would call the *Gentiles* in the days of *Messias*, and that they should then be received into his Grace and Favour:

Favour: This is an Argument beyond exception againſt the Perpetuity of the Law of *Moſes*, and that thoſe Laws were intended for no longer than the time when this great Event ſhould come to paſs; then theſe *Topical* or *Local* Statutes muſt give way to thoſe Laws by which God would govern the World. Theſe Laws of *Moſes* are like the *Municipal* Laws of a certain City, which are of force till the Prince and Law-maker ſhall think fit to govern all his Subjects in all Parts of his Dominion by one and the ſame Law. Can any Man think that the Gentiles ſhould be governed by theſe Laws of *Moſes*, which were peculiar to the *Jews*? Would they be obliged three times a year from the remoteſt Parts of the World to go up to *Jeruſalem*? Muſt they be governed by the Political Laws which the *Jews* were governed by? Muſt *they* keep the Paſſeover in remembrance of deliverance from *Egypt*, who never were delivered thence? Shall *they* keep the other Feſtivals, who were never concerned in thoſe Precepts or in the grounds of them? Hoſ. 2.23. Zech. 8.22. 9.9, 10. Mal. 1.11.

4. The Practice as well as the Doctrine of ſeveral of the *Jews* aſſure us that their Law was not indiſpenſible, and conſequently not of perpetual Obligation. They admitted of Proſelytes of old, who were

were ſo far from undertaking to obey all the Laws of *Moſes*, that they only took upon them the Obſervation of the Precepts of the *Sons of Noah*. Nor do we find that *Moſes* perſwades *Jethro* to ſubmit to his Laws. *Jonah* preacheth Repentance to the *Ninevites*, but not the Neceſſity of Circumciſion or of Sacrifices: Nor do we find any other Prophets urging theſe things upon any of the *Gentiles*. The Law of *Moſes* did indeed oblige the *Jews*: But yet in ſome Caſes theſe Laws were diſpenſible, and good Men did diſpenſe with them: Not to ſay how many things there were which did *pellere Sabbatum*, i. e. excuſe them from reſting on the Sabbath-day, we find holy Men ſometimes going croſs to ſome of the Precepts of *Moſes*, and are no where blamed for it. We know that the Shew-bread was to be eaten by the Prieſt only; and yet *David* did eat it without any Reproof. By the Law of *Moſes*, thoſe who were hanged might not hang on the Tree all Night: And yet *Saul's* Sons in *David's* time hanged on the Tree ſeveral Days and Nights together. They were according to the Law to offer their Sacrifices at *Jeruſalem*: And yet *Elijah* offered elſewhere; and in the days of *Hezekiah* they did eat the Paſſeover *otherwiſe than it was written*.

2 Sam. 21. 10

2 Chr. 30. 18.

The

The *Hebrew* Doctors teach, that when they warred against the Gentiles, in case of Scarcity or Famine they might eat Carkasses, or what was torn, or Swine's Flesh. And that it was lawful to transgress the Law it self, לצירך השעה, in *case of present Necessity*. They taught that the *Sanhedrin*, or any Prophet who was owned for a true one, had Authority to dispense with all the Precepts and Rites of the Law (excepting always the Case of Idolatry) for a certain Time. This is a clear Argument that these Laws had no antecedent Goodness, and were not therefore of Eternal and Perpetual Obligation.

R. Bechai in legem fol. 211. Col. 1. v. Lipman. Nizachon. p. 211. Respons. Judaic. ad 23. quæst. Quæst. 18. Edit. 1644.

It is farther observable from the *Jewish* Writers, that they taught that their Law was not to endure for ever. Thus from the *Jalkut* we are told, *That God would give a New Law by the Hand of the Messias*. Again, *that in the time to come*, or, *in the* days *of Messias, all Oblations should cease, excepting the Sacrifice of Praise*. And by another we are told that *all their Festivals should cease, excepting their Purim and Day of Expiation*. And there is a saying amongst them, that *in the Days of the Messias God will permit the eating of Swine's Flesh*.

v. Verstium in Abravenel. de cap. fidei c. 13.

5. God

Hagg. 2. 6.

5. God hath given us notice that He would put an end to the inſtitutions of *Moſes*, in the days of *Meſſias*. Thus we read in the Prophet *Haggai*. *Yet once, it is a little while, and I will ſhake the Heavens and the Earth, and the Sea, and the dry Land*, &c. Theſe words import a great Mutation of things, and manifeſtly refer to the days of the *Meſſias*, as I have elſewhere made to appear. The Deſtruction of a Kingdom or Polity is among the ancient *Hebrews* expreſſed after this manner: The ſhaking of the Heaven and Earth ſignifie the Deſtruction of the *Jewiſh* Polity, and conſequently of thoſe *Ritual* and *Political* Laws which muſt of neceſſity fall with it. *Maimonides* hath obſerved truly, that the Deſtruction of a Nation, in the Scripture-dialect, is paraboliſcally deſcrib'd by the trembling of the Heavens, and Commotion of the Earth (of which many inſtances and proofs may be found referred to in the Margent) and he tells us that when the *Arabians* would deſcribe a Man that had met with ſome ſingular Misfortune, they would ſay, *Cælum ipſius ſuper terram ejus cecidit*, that is, *His Heaven is tumbled down upon his Earth*. He adds that it is uſual to ſpeak of a Kingdom, as if it were the whole World.

Hagg. 2 6.
Iſa. 13. 10, 13.
Iſa. 34. 4.
Ezek. 32. 7.
Jer. 4. 23.
Joel 2. 10.
Amos 9. 5.
Dan. 8. 10.
Iſa. 2. 19, 21.
1 Maccab. 1. 28.

More Nevochim p. 2. c. 29.

No

No wonder then that the Deſtruction of the *Jewiſh* Polity ſhould be deſcribed as it is (*Matth.* 24.) in words that ſeem to import the Deſtruction of the whole World. When the Law of *Moſes* was given the *Earth ſhook*, and ſo did the Heavens with *Thunder*; nor is it ſtrange that the *removing* of this Law ſhould be deſcribed in the ſame terms by which the *ſetting it up* at firſt is deſcribed. In the days of our *Jeſus* ſomething happened which complies with the very Letter of this Prediction. The Heaven was *moved*, when the Voice came thence, and the *Earth did quake*, and *the Rocks rent*; and a very great Earthquake happened ſometime before the Birth of *Jeſus*, in the days of *Herod* the *great*, a very fit *Prelude* to the great Mutation of things predicted in this Prophet.

Matt. 24. 7, 29, 17. Mark 13. 8, 13, 24, 25. Luke 21. 11, 25, 26.

v. R. D. Ganz. Zemach David. p. 84.

Upon the whole matter then, the *Jew* hath no Cauſe to complain that the Author of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* ſhould apply this Paſſage to this matter: For there is nothing ſtrained in it, and nothing but what is perfectly agreeable to the way of ſpeaking uſed by the moſt ancient *Hebrew* Writers. His words are theſe, *whoſe Voice then ſhook the Earth: But now he hath promiſed ſaying, yet once more I ſhake, not the Earth only, but alſo Heaven. And this*

this word, yet once more, ſignifyeth the removing of thoſe things that are ſhaken, as of things that are made, that thoſe things which cannot be ſhaken may remain. (Heb. 12. 26, 27.) "*q. d.* as the Law of *Moſes* was given "with great Solemnity, and particularly "with the ſhaking of Mount *Sinai*; ſo "God hath promiſed, that there ſhould "come a time that ſhall be attended with "another great Change of things, expreſ-"ſed by *ſhaking once more the Earth and* "*the Heaven*; by which no leſs is meant "than this, that thoſe Laws of *Moſes*, "which were of poſitive Inſtitution, and "therefore mutable, ſhould be taken a-"way, that the Doctrine of the *Meſſias*, "which is to endure for ever, might be "brought into the World and remain "with us.

I add what we find expreſly to the ſame Purpoſe in the Prophet *Jeremy*, in the following words. *Behold the days come, ſaith the Lord, that I will make a new Covenant with the Houſe of Iſrael, and with the Houſe of Judah. Not according to the Covenant that I made with their Fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the Land of Egypt*, &c. *But this ſhall be the Covenant that I will make with the Houſe of Iſrael, after thoſe days, ſaith the Lord; I will put my*

my Law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and I will be their God, and they ſhall be my People. (Jer. 31. 31.) God will make a *New Covenant*; he does not ſay he will *renew the old.* He will write his *Law* in their *Hearts*; what Law? Not the Inſtitutions of *Moſes*; *not according to the Covenant that I made with their Fathers*, &c.

6. God hath by his Providence declared, that the Inſtitutions of *Moſes* were never deſigned to oblige for ever. For ſince theſe Precepts were annexed to a certain Land, and Place in that Land, as the *Ritual* Precepts were; and others, that were *Political*, concerned the *Jews* only ſo long only as they continued a diſtinct Polity: Thoſe Precepts are now expired, becauſe the *Jews* are diſpoſſeſſed of that Land, and have not been a diſtinct Polity for about 1600 Years. God hath by his Providence rendred theſe Laws unpracticable. All the Laws about Sacrifices fell with the Temple; many fell with the City of *Jeruſalem*; and when the *Jews* ceaſed to be a Polity, their Political Laws were rendred Null.

V. Chryſoſtom Tom. 6. p. 318. Edit. Savil.

Without doubt theſe Laws were given for wiſe Reaſons; they diſtinguiſhed the *Jews* from the Idolatrous Nations, and were deſigned to preſerve them from their Idolatrous

Idolatrous Practices; they were Tryals of their Obedience, and many of them Types of ſome better things to come; but 'tis in the mean time very evident, that they were not given to all Mankind, nor deſigned to oblige for ever.

III. I ſhall anſwer the Pretences of the *Jews* produced above.

(1.) 'Tis pretended that when theſe Laws were given, they were not given for that *Seaſon* only, and Occaſion, but were delivered as Statutes and Ordinances *for ever*. Thus the Feaſt of unleavened Bread is ſaid to be an *Ordinance for ever*. (Exod. 12. 17.) The Sabbath is called a *perpetual Covenant*, (Exod. 31. 16.) To which I anſwer,

1. That it is certain, and confeſſed among the *Jews*, that the word *Olam*, which we render by *Ever*, does not ſignifie always *Eternity*, but a limited and determinate time. *Joſeph Albo* confeſſeth thus much, and produceth ſeveral Inſtances for Proof of it. What is ſaid to be for ever, is to abide to ſome ſtated and fixed time. 'Tis ſaid of the Servant, that he ſhall ſerve his Maſter *for ever*. (Exod. 21. 6.) i. e. *To the Jubilee*, ſays the *Targumiſt*; the Year of Jubilee was the utmoſt extent of that Service. *Hannah* ſays of *Samuel*, That

Ikkarim, part. 3. c. 16.

Targum. Jon. in Exod. 21. 6.

That he ſhould appear before the Lord, and there abide *for ever*, (1 Sam. 1. 22.) which yet can be meant of no longer Time than that of his Life, or that part of his Life in which he was fit to miniſter legally. Whence it appears that the *Eternal* Obligation of theſe Laws cannot be proved from this Expreſſion.

2. It is to be remembred that among the Precepts given to *Moſes*, as hath been noted before, ſome were only *occaſional* and *pro hâc vice*; others were to be *continued* in After-ages. Theſe latter, with Contra-diſtinction to the former, may be ſaid to be Statutes and Ordinances for ever. I will give an Inſtance in this Place that is very pertinent to my preſent Purpoſe. The *Paſſeover* was ordained in *Egypt*, and the firſt *Paſſeover* was kept there: This Feaſt was to be kept in the Land of *Canaan*, and ſo it was. The *Jewiſh* Doctours do carefully diſtinguiſh between the *Paſſeover* of *Egypt*, and the *Paſſeover* of After-ages; and tell us of ſome Rites peculiar to the *Paſſeover* of *Egypt*, which were not uſed in the *Paſſeover* of After-ages. *Abravanel* reckons them up; they are theſe, (1) The taking up the Lamb four days before. (2) The ſprinkling of the Blood upon the Poſts of the Houſe. (3) Eating the Paſſeover with

פסח מצרים

פסח דורות

Abravanel in legem, fol. 150. col. 2.

Loins girt, Shoes on their Feet, and Staves in their Hand. Theſe Rites were peculiar to that firſt Paſſeover, and not uſed in After-times. But Unleavened-bread was to continue and to be a conſtant Attendant upon the Paſſeover for all ſucceeding Generations; and upon that Conſideration no wonder that it is called *an Ordinance for ever*, becauſe it was to continue as long as the Paſſeover.

3. When theſe Precepts were given, which are ſaid to be *for ever*, we find ſomething in the very Text which determines the utmoſt Extent of this Expreſſion, and which aſſures us that as theſe things were to continue to *ſucceeding Generations*, and were not barely for the *preſent Occaſion*, ſo they were to continue no longer than the *Jewiſh* State or Polity ſhould continue. And it will be worth our while to obſerve with what Exactneſs this Matter is delivered in the Law of *Moſes*. For theſe Laws which are ſaid to be *for ever*, are ſaid to be ſo in *their Generations*, or *future Ages*, as hath been explained, and in *their Dwellings*: Which two Expreſſions reſtrain that indefinite Phraſe of *for ever*, and confine it to the *Jewiſh Country*, and *Polity*. The Law which forbad the Eating of Fat and Blood is called a perpetual Statute; but

but then it follows *for your Generations, throughout all your Dwellings*, (Lev. 3. 17.) The eating of Fat which was forbid, was the Fat of thoſe Beaſts which were admitted as Sacrifices; (*Levit.* 7. 23, 25.) and when Sacrifices ceaſed, which were annexed to a certain Place, this Law ceaſed likewiſe. The Law of afflicting their Souls on the Day of Expiation is ſaid to be a *Statute for ever*, (Levit. 16. 31.) But then this is confined by thoſe Expreſſions in which it is ſaid to be a Statute *to them* throughout *their Generations*, and in *all their Dwellings*, (Levit. 23. 31.) The ſame reſtrictions we find annexed to the Laws of the *Sheaf* of *Firſt-fruits*, (Levit. 23. 14.) Of the *two Wave-loaves*, (Levit. 23. 17, 21.) The Law of *burning the Lamps*, (Lev. 24. 3.) Of *blowing the Trumpets*, (Numb. 10. 8.) Of the *Meat* and *Drink offering*, (Numb. 15. 15.) The Service of the *Levites*, (Numb. 18. 23.) Of *the Prieſthood of Aaron*, (Exod. 40. 15.) Of the Prieſts abſtaining from *Wine* and *Strong drink* when they were in their Miniſtration, (*Levit.* 10. 9.) Of the offering of the Blood at the Door of the Tabernacle, (*Levit.* 17. 7.) Theſe Laws however they are ſaid to be Statutes or Ordinances for ever, yet are explained as they are confined to their Generations, as they are all. God ſays of *Zion*, *This is*

my Rest for ever, (Ps. 132. 14.) *Here will I dwell.* But as God hath for the Sins of the *Jews* forsaken that Place, so all those Sacrifices and Services annexed unto it did thereupon cease of themselves.

II. 'Tis pleaded that, as an Argument that this Law was to oblige for ever, it was provided that nothing should be added to it, or taken from it. *Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it,* (Deut. 4. 2.) And hence it may be pretended that this Law being perfect is unalterable also. To which I answer;

1. That this Law was given to the *Jews* only; God did not by that lay a restraint upon himself. *They* were not to add or diminish, according to their own Pleasure, but *God* might do it as seemed good to his Wisdom; as Food and Nourishment is altered according to the Capacity of those who receive it. This *Joseph Albo* himself says in this Argument, and upon Occasion of this Plea.

Joseph Albo Sciarim, p. 3. c. 14.

2. That as God in those words does not restrain himself, so 'tis certain that he hath declared that he would make *a New Covenant*; That he would once more *shake the Heaven and the Earth*; That he would raise up *another Prophet*, like unto *Moses*, And

Jer. 31. 31.

Hagg. 2. 6.

Deut. 18. 15, 18.

And put his words in his Mouth; and *ſet up a Kingdom that ſhall never be deſtroyed*; and *bring in everlaſting Righteouſneſs*; and make with them *an everlaſting Covenant*; and alſo that he would *create New Heavens and a New Earth*, and that the *former ſhall not be remembred nor come into mind.* Dan. 2.44. Dan 9.24. Iſa. 55. 3. Iſa. 65. 17.

III. 'Tis pretended that the devout *Pſalmiſt* ſays ſuch great things of the Law of God, as ſpeak it to be unchangeable. He does every where, upon all occaſions, magnifie it: It would be endleſs to bring in the many things he ſays upon this Argument. To which I anſwer;

1. That as to the *Moral* Precepts, we have no diſpute with the *Jews*, but readily grant them to be unalterable: Certain it is that the *Pſalmiſt* does not, when he magnifies the Law, exclude theſe Precepts.

2. That as to many of the *Poſitive* Inſtitutions which are called *Statutes*, and *Judgments*, or *Teſtimonies*, theſe were ſuch as did inſinuate and commend ſome *Moral Vertue*; ſuch as were deſigned to keep the *Iſraelites* from Idolatry; ſuch as were ſhadows of ſome better thing to come. Upon which Conſiderations it is no wonder that the Divine *Pſalmiſt* ſhould upon all

occasions speak great things of this Law which was given by *Moses*. The *Political* Laws were founded upon Equity, suited to that People, that Time and Place; and for the *Rituals*, they had a Spiritual meaning, and were many of them very instructive in Moral or Spiritual Matters. Thus Circumcision was a Sign of God's Covenant, a Mark of their being dedicated to the true God, and that they were his Property and Peculiar; and this cutting off their Fore-skin minded them of pairing away their Superfluity of Naughtiness, or the evil *Superfluities of their Mind*, as *Philo* the *Jew* expresseth it. Their Sacrifices were offered to God alone, and were accepted only as they were Signs of inward Reverence toward God, of Contrition for their Sins, of Gratitude, of Faith, and Hope in God, or as they had reference to something better. God expected that he who laid his Hands upon the Head of the Sacrifice might from a good Conscience be able to say, (as the same *Philo* expresseth it) *These Hands have received no Bribes, nor have they been polluted with innocent Blood. They have not maimed any Man, nor been used injuriously in wounding or oppression; They have not ministred to lewd or vile Actions, but have been employed in good or profitable things.* Their great and

Τὰς περιττὰς φύσεις τῆς ἡγεμονικῆς. *Philo. de victim offerens.*

Philo. Ibid.

and solemn Feasts were Commemorations of the Divine Bounty. Their Laws about the Fringes of their Garments, and writing the Law in their Houses were designed against Idolatry. Their Laws about Cities of Refuge, concerning Dominion, Purchasing, Property, Trespasses, were such as commanded Justice and Equity.

There were also many of their Positive Laws which recommended to the *Israelites* Humanity, and Mercy towards the Destitute and Miserable. Such were the Law by which they were in their Wars obliged to offer Peace, and to make no havock or wast of Fruit-bearing-trees during a Siege. Such were the Laws about the *forgotten Sheaf*, and the *Corner* of the *Field*, and the *Third* Years *Tithing*, and the Increase of the *Sabbatical Year*. All Cruelty was forbid; to this purpose *Blood* was forbid, and the killing a *Cow* or *Ewe*, and their Young in one Day, the taking a *Nest of Birds* and *Dam* together, the taking the *Millstone* to pledge (with which they grinded Bread, the Support of Life) and the *Muzzling* the Oxe that trod out the Corn. *Josephus* observes that the Law that obliged them to appear at *Jerusalem*, three times a Year, tended to maintain Friendship and Good-will. And that Law of the Peace-offering, when it was for

Deut. 20. 10, 19. Οὐ δεῖ πολεμεῖν πρὸς τὰ μὴ πολέμια. *Philo de Charitate.* Deut. 15. 7. 24. 19.

Deut. 22. 28, v. 6, 7.

Joseph Antiq. l. 4. c. 8. Ubi supra. Levit. 7. 15, 16.

Thankſgiving, by which the Offerer was obliged to eat his Portion of the Offering on the ſame Day in which it was offered; and in caſe it were for a Vow or voluntary Offering it was to be eaten on the Morrow at fartheſt, did maintain and promote Charity and Hoſpitality. I need not add that many other Laws inſinuated Purity, and Temperance, and Chaſtity, &c. Upon theſe Conſiderations the *Pſalmiſt* might well magnifie this Law of God, which yet does by no means infer that all the *Political* and *Ritual* Precepts of that Law were to oblige for ever.

Theodoret. in Levit. qu. 6.

3. To this purpoſe it is farther to be conſidered, that though the *Pſalmiſt* magnifie the Law in general, yet we do not find that he lays any great Streſs upon particular Rites and Inſtitutions abſolutely and ſeparately. For *Sacrifices*, he is ſo far from magnifying them upon their own Account, that he ſpeaks in diminution of them, and magnifies the *Sacrifice* of *Praiſe*, and of a *broken Heart*. For outward *Circumciſion*, he does not extoll it, as the *Jews* do in their Publick Offices; nor does he cry up the *Waſhings* and *Purifications* that were bodily; but a *clean Heart* indeed he prays earneſtly for, and 'tis plain that he contends for the inward Circumciſion of the Mind. In a word, the

Pſ. 50. 14. 51. 17.

Pſ. 51. 10.

the *Psalmist* magnifies the Law, and had good reason so to do; but then he considers it as fraught with Moral Precepts, and Spiritual Instructions: And however it is certain that he took it for Divine, it does not hence follow that it was altogether unchangeable.

IV. If it be said in behalf of this Law that the *Jews* prospered when they obeyed it, and that all their Miseries were owing to their Disobedience; I answer

1. That this is only an Argument that this Law came from God, who did foretell the Miseries which would befall the *Jews* for their Disobedience. Of this we have no Controversie with the *Jews* at all.

2. But there is no reason to conclude from hence that this Law was to continue for ever. The *Jews* were obliged to obey it whiles it did oblige them; it follows not from this that it was to continue.

V. It may be pleaded that upon the ceasing of the Spirit of Prophecy in *Israel*, and in the very Close of the Canon of the Old Testament, the *Jews* are put in mind to adhere to the Law of *Moses*. *Remember ye the Law of* Moses *my Servant, which I com-*

I commanded to him in Horeb, *for all* Iſrael, *with the Statutes and Judgments*; (Malach. 4. 4.) By which it appears the *Jews* were obliged, not only to the *Moral* Precepts, but to the *Poſitive Inſtitutions*, called by the Prophet the *Statutes* and *Judgments*. To which I anſwer

1. That there was great reaſon for thoſe words of the Prophet, *Remember ye the Law of* Moſes, *&c.* This, though it do not infer the Perpetuity of that Law, was yet at that Time a very ſeaſonable Admonition, whether we look back upon the Time *paſt*, or forward upon the Time *to come*.

For the Time *paſt*, it is to be conſidered that the *Jews* were but newly returned from the Captivity of *Babylon*, into their own *Land*. They were ſent to *Babylon* for the Breach of this Law; whiles they were there it was in great Meaſure unpracticable, becauſe many of its Precepts were annexed to their own *Land*; when they were returned they were ignorant of their Law, and ſome of them ſeem not ſo much as to underſtand the Language in which 'twas written, (*Nehemiah* 8. 8.) Beſides, they continued in the Breach of it even after their return; By *Uſury* and Oppreſſion; (*Neh.* 5. 10.) By profaning the *Sabbath*; (Neh. 13. 15.)

By

By *ſtrange* and forbidden *Marriages*; (Neh. 13. 23. with *Ezr.* 9. 2.) So that they ſtill *forſook the Commandment*; (Ezr. 9. 10.) Beſides all this, this Prophet *Malachy* complains of their *Ingratitude*, (Chap. 1. 2.) Of their *Profaneneſs*, (Verſ. 12.) Of their *Idolatry*, (Ch. 2. 11.) Of their *Treachery* and *Unbelief*, (Ch. 2. 14, 17.) Of their *Rebellion*, *Sacrilege*, and *Inſolence*, (Ch. 3. *v.* 7, 8, 13.) Upon the whole Matter then, nothing could be more ſeaſonable than this Admonition, *Remember ye the Law of* Moſes, *&c.*

For the Time *to come*, 'tis certain, and the *Jews* confeſs it, that from the Time of *Malachy*, Prophecy ceaſed in the Land of *Iſrael*. Theſe Prophets had continued from the Times of *Moſes*, and the *Jewiſh* Writings tell us who they were who propheſied in the ſeveral Ages ſucceſſively. They were of great uſe to the *Jews*, and warned them upon all occaſions, both of their *Duty*, and their *Danger*. Henceforth, when Prophecy ſhould ceaſe, nothing could be more ſeaſonable than to mind them, to attend to the written word of God; *Remember the Law of* Moſes, *&c.* 2 Chron. 36. 15, 16.

2. What follows in the Prophet *Malachy* does help to clear this Difficulty, and convince us not only that this Law is not of perpetual Obligation, but how long it

Was

was to endure at fartheſt. *Behold I will ſend you* Elijah *the Prophet, before the coming of the Great and Dreadfull* (or Illuſtrious) *Day of the Lord*, (Malach. 4. 5.) That this Promiſe of *Elijah* was fulfilled in *J. Baptiſt*, I have elſewhere proved; and ſhewed conſequently upon that, that by the Great and Illuſtrious Day of the Lord, is meant the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* by the *Romans*, and Diſſolution of the *Jewiſh* Polity. Upon the whole Matter then we ſee the Extent of the Obligation of the *Moſaical* Inſtitutions, to the coming of this *Elijah*, (*The Law and the Prophets were until* John, *Luke* 16. 16.) or at the utmoſt to the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, and the Temple, and Diſſipation of the *Jewiſh* Polity, and Diſperſion of that People. Then, at fartheſt, the Political and Ritual Laws, given to the *Jews*, and annexed to that Land, would ceaſe of themſelves.

The Senſe of the fourth and fifth Verſes of this fourth Chapter of *Malachy*, may be taken in this following Paraphraſe; q. d. *Since for your Diſobedience to the Law of* Moſes *ye have been Captives in* Babylon, *and have not ſince your Return been reduced to due Obedience thereunto, which bodes you ſome future Calamity; And ſeeing that you are not like to enjoy Pro-*

phets

phets to remind you of your Duty, as ye have in former Ages, ſee that ye keep ſtrictly to the Laws and Inſtitutions of Moſes: *And be aſſured of this, that I will in due Time ſend you one in the Spirit of* Elijah, *to ſupply the Defect of Prophecy among you: And this Perſon ſhall appear ſome Time before the Deſtruction of your Polity, and Diſperſion of your Nation, when a final End will be put to the Poſitive Inſtitutions of* Moſes, *which in the mean Time you are inviolably to obſerve and adhere unto.*

VI. 'Tis a weak pretence to this purpoſe, that this Law is called *an Inheritance*; (Deut. 33. 4.) which ſuppoſeth it was to deſcend and continue.

The Anſwer is eaſie from the very words where this Law is called ſo: For 'tis called the *Inheritance of the Congregation of Jacob*. 'Twas to continue; I grant it: But no longer than the *Jewiſh* Polity continued. It was a *Law* but no longer than they, to whom 'twas given, were a *People*. They are now no Commonwealth or Kingdom: No wonder then that their *Political* Laws ſhould ceaſe, when their *Polity* is deſtroyed; and that their *Rituals* ſhould receive an End, when there is no room left for the Practice of them.

But

VII. But 'tis urged by the *Jews* with much fairer ſhew in behalf of their Law, that our *Jeſus* ſaid, That *He did not come to deſtroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil:* And, that *till Heaven and Earth paſs, one Jot or one Tittle ſhall in no wiſe paſs from the Law, till all be fulfilled,* (Matt. 5. 17, 18.) To this I anſwer

1. That when *Jeſus* ſays, he did not come to deſtroy the Law and Prophets but to fulfil, he ſpeaks of the *Moral* Precepts of it; which he was ſo far from removing, that he required of his Followers a greater Degree of Sanctity than the bare Letter imported, and than the greateſt Contenders for it had arrived unto. He required an inward and ſpiritual Obedience to theſe Precepts. Let any Man but read that Chapter, where theſe words are found, and he will find great cauſe to believe that *Jeſus* ſpeaks there of the *Moral* Law. For beſides that he puts his Followers all along that Chapter upon the Practice of theſe Precepts, he quotes ſeveral Precepts of the *Decalogue*, and requires an inward and ſpiritual Obedience to them. And there being no doubt of the Perpetuity of this Law, I need not give any other Anſwer to this Objection. For our Lord fulfilled this Law, when

when by his Doctrine he gained the great End of it, *Viz.* the higheſt Pitch of Sanctity, the greateſt Love of God and of our Neighbour, which is the Drift and Summ of the *Law* and *Prophets*. But that there may be no room left for Cavil, I ſhall ſhew how our Lord might be ſaid alſo to fulfill the *Ritual* and *Political* Law, and how his words may be underſtood without any need of inferring the Perpetuity of theſe Laws. Wherefore

1. For the *Ritual* or *Ceremonial* Laws, our Saviour was ſo far from deſtroying them, that he fulfilled them. That is, he obeyed them himſelf, and brought Men by his Holy Doctrines to all that Purity and Sanctity which the Laws concerning Sacrifices and Purifications did inſinuate and typifie: Beſides, theſe Laws that were *typical* were *fulfilled* in *him*, the *Antitype*; and thus he fulfilled the *Prophets* alſo, as the Prophecies before were in the Event *fulfilled* in *him*. There was not the minuteſt Prophecy that concerned either the Birth, or Kindred, or Life, or Sufferings of the *Meſſias*, but what was fulfilled in our *Jeſus*. 'Tis true, *Jeſus* uſed no Violence to pull down the Ritual Law of *Moſes*; He did not come to *deſtroy*. But he was the *Subſtance* of the Legal Shadows; he made

made good in the Event of things the Prophetical Predictions, he gained all the Spiritual Ends of thoſe Carnal Precepts; and ſo might well be ſaid not to deſtroy, but fulfil. But all this does not ſpeak the Perpetuity of thoſe Laws: For they fell of themſelves, when the Temple fell; and when the *Gentiles* were received into the Church of God, thoſe diſterminating and diſcriminating Laws, like a Partition-wall, fell without any violent Hand to tumble them down.

3. For the *Political* Laws, *Jeſus* did not come to deſtroy them, but to fulfill. Theſe Laws were deſigned for that People, and during the Continuance of that Polity: the End of theſe Laws was the common Good and Safety of the Community. Our Lord tranſgreſſed none of theſe Laws: He on the other Hand taught a Doctrine ſo good and profitable to Kingdoms and Polities, that the Practice of thoſe Precepts will gain the End of the beſt Political Laws. His Laws tend to the Security of Governments, the Peace of the People, the flouriſhing Condition of all Polities and publick Societies.

The great End of all theſe Laws was to make Men better, and to make them happy. Our Lord by his Laws hath laid a Foundation for gaining this great End; and

and he that does ſo may be truly ſaid not to *deſtroy* but to *fulfill*. There are in theſe Poſitive Precepts of *Moſes* two things to be conſidered, *Viz.* Firſt the *Rites* and *Ceremonies* therein preſcribed; with reſpect to theſe barely conſidered this Law of *Moſes* is ſaid to be a *Carnal Commandment*: But then the *Scope* and *End* of this Law is alſo to be conſidered, and with reſpect to this End this Law is called *Spiritual*, becauſe that was the ultimate End and Purpoſe of it. Now certain it is that as *Jeſus* yielded Obedience to the *Rites* and *Ceremonies* of *Moſes*, and did no violence to that Law as it was a Carnal Commandment, and ſo might truly be ſaid *not* to *deſtroy*; ſo, as he gained the great *End* of that Law, and brought Men over to the *ſpiritual* and inward Meaning of it, he might truly be ſaid to *fulfill* it. The Law, then, receiving this Accompliſhment in our Lord *Jeſus*, 'tis no wonder that our Saviour ſhould ſay, that *till Heaven and Earth paſs, one Jot or one Tittle ſhall in no wiſe paſs from the Law, till all be fulfilled.* The meaning of which words is this, that Heaven and Earth ſhould aſſoon paſs away, as the leaſt part of the Law or Prophets ſhould fail to receive its due Accompliſhment.

Heb. 7. 16. with Rom. 7. 14.

And now 'tis no wonder at all that *Jeſus* ſhould obey the Law of *Moſes*, that he ſhould ſhew that *Reſpect* he did to thoſe Poſitive Inſtitutions; that he ſhould give a Deference to the *Aaronical* Prieſts, obſerve the Rites of the Paſſeover, and regard the Sabbath; or that the Apoſtles ſhould have a great regard to the *Jews* in their Council at *Jeruſalem*. All theſe things do not prove the Perpetuity of the Laws of *Moſes*; they only confirm what our Saviour ſays, that he did not come to *deſtroy* but to *fulfil*. Theſe Laws expired of themſelves, when the *Jews* ceaſed to be a Polity, and the Church of God.

VIII. For what is pretended from the *Parable*, in behalf of this Law of *Moſes*, *Viz.* that the Rich-man's Brethren are referred unto it, as a Means by which they might be preſerved from future Miſery; I anſwer,

1. That they are not referred barely to the *Ritual*, and *Political*, and *Poſitive Conſtitutions*, but to *Moſes* and the *Prophets*: Now *Moſes* and the *Prophets* were fraught with many excellent Precepts of *Morality*, ſerving greatly the uſe of Life.

2. That *Moſes* and the *Prophets* were the Rule by which the *Jews* were to govern themſelves during the Oeconomy of *Moſes*:

Moſes: But becauſe they were, whiles thoſe Laws ſtood in force, to govern themſelves by them, it does not thence follow that all thoſe Laws ſhall oblige for ever.

IX. The Pretence from the words of S. *Paul* is of greater Moment; he ſays that he is ſo far *from making void the Law by Faith*, that he adds theſe words, *yea, we eſtabliſh the Law*, (Rom. 3. 31.) Now if the Doctrine of Juſtification by Faith, without the Works of the Law, does not *make* it *void*; nay, if it be ſo far from making it void that it does rather *eſtabliſh* it, the Law is in force ſtill, and of perpetual Obligation. To which I anſwer,

1. That the Doctrine of Juſtification by Faith does not make void the Law, as by the Law is meant the *Moral* Law, or that part of the Law of *Moſes* which obligeth Men to Piety towards God, to Juſtice and Charity, to Humility and Temperance, *&c.* Becauſe a lively and juſtifying *Faith* requires all that Piety and Goodneſs which that *Law* required. Nay, we are ſo far from being diſcharged from our Obedience to thoſe *Moral* Precepts, that we are obliged to obey them from higher Conſiderations than were expreſly made known to the *Jews* (ſuch are the Threats

of Hell, and Promiſe of Eternal Life) and in a more refined and ſpiritual Senſe than the Letter of the Law, and Interpretation of the Carnal *Jews* amounted to. It is not enough that we do not ſwear falſly: We are not allowed to ſwear by any Creature; or in our ordinary Converſation to ſwear at all, even when we do it to confirm a Truth. So far are we by the Doctrine of Faith from being allowed to ſhed our Brother's Blood, that we may not be angry with him without a Cauſe, call him an empty Fellow, or repreſent him as a wicked Man or Fool, without the greateſt Danger to our ſelves. And ſo far are we, by this Doctrine of Juſtification by Faith alone, from being allowed to commit Adultery, that we may not look on a Woman to luſt after her. And for Juſtice, Humanity, and Acts of Mercy, we are taught not to reſtrain theſe things to our own Country-men, or thoſe of our own Religion only (as the *Jews* too commonly did) but we are obliged to be juſt and kind to all the World, and to call every other Man our Neighbour. Indeed the Doctrine of Juſtification by Faith alone, without the Works of the Law, may be ſo groſly miſunderſtood, as thereby to render thoſe Moral Precepts of *Moſes* uſeleſs, and void: But then our Holy

Holy Religion allows not of such a Doctrine. For we own the Necessity of a most Holy Life, and all Manner of Works of Piety, Justice and Mercy, (*Matt.*25.35. 2 *Cor.* 5.10. *Tit.* 2.11, 12.)

2. This Doctrine of Faith is so far from destroying this Law, that 'tis accompanied with Grace and Power enabling Men to obey these Precepts; and to do this more exactly and universally than was ever done before. The Law it self was destitute of this Power and Divine Assistance: It required Obedience, indeed; but did not enable Men to obey: The Effusion of the Holy Ghost was a Blessing reserved to the Days of the *Messias*; the Prophets of old foretold it, and our *Jesus* made it good. The Gospel is the *Ministration of the Spirit*: On the other hand the Law was weak; it directed Men to Obedience, but did not assist them powerfully. Of this Matter I have discoursed elsewhere. That which helps us to obey the Law, is so far from making it void, that it may be truly said to establish it. And this the Doctrine of Faith does. Part I. pag. 434. &c.

3. The Doctrine of Faith is so far from making the very *Typical* and *Ritual* Law void, that it rather does *establish* it, as it exhibits and represents to us the *substance*

of thoſe things of which the Law had but the *Types* and *Shadows*. Hence it is that
John 1.14 the Goſpel or Doctrine of Faith, in oppoſition to the Law, is called *Truth*.

4. The Doctrine of Faith, or the *Chriſtian* Religion delivered in the Goſpel, is ſo far from making the Law and Prophets void, that 'tis the Verification and Completion of thoſe Teſtimonies which are there to be found of the *Meſſias*, and of thoſe things which were to be fulfilled in
Part I. *ch.* 10. him. This I have proved at large elſewhere. And this the Apoſtle obſerves, (Rom. 3. 21.) *But now the Righteouſneſs of God without the Law is manifeſted, being witneſſed by the Law and the Prophets.*

For the Political, or Commonwealth Laws, 'tis evident that the Apoſtle does not in this Place refer to them. They were not the Laws of the *Jews* conſidered as a *Church*, but as a *Polity*: They muſt ceaſe when the *Jews* ceaſed to be a People, or Body Politick; and had no Concern in their Juſtification as Sinners.

And for the words of *Iſaiah*, Chap. 59. Verſ. 21. They ſerve not the purpoſe of the *Jews*, they being an expreſs Promiſe referring to the Days of the *Meſſias*, as is evident

evident from the foregoing words. *And the Redeemer ſhall come to* Zion, *and unto them that turn from Tranſgreſſion in* Jacob, *ſaith the Lord. And as for me, this is my Covenant*, &c.

Thus have I proved that the Law of *Moſes* is not of *Perpetual* Obligation.

CHAP. II.

The CONTENTS.

Prophecies of the Peaceable *Time of the* Meſſias. *The* Jews *affirm that theſe are not fulfilled in the Days of* Jeſus. *They alſo alledge the Words of* Jeſus, *Matth.* 10. 34. Jeſus *and his Religion defended againſt this Charge. The Import of the foregoing Prophecies. How far thoſe Prophecies have been fulfilled already. What ground we have to believe that thoſe Prophecies will be farther fulfill'd.* Dan. 2. 44. *conſidered, as alſo* Dan. 7. Matth. 10 34. *conſidered at large and compared with a Parallel Place,* Luke 12. 5.

Nizzachon vet. p. 96. Rambam diſput. cum fratre Paulo p. 41. R. Iſaac Chizuk Emun. l. 1. p. 41. Fortalitium Fidei de bello Judæorum, l. 3.

THere are many Prophecies in the Old Teſtament concerning the *peaceable* Times of the *Meſſias:* And the *Jews* do very frequently upbraid us Chriſtians with our Quarrels and Wars; and from thence they infer that our *Jeſus* is not the *Chriſt* that was to come. It muſt be confeſſed that the Prophets do foretell that there ſhould be abundance of Peace in the Days of the *Meſſias:* That then Men *ſhould beat their Swords into Plowſhares,*

ſhares, and their Spears into Pruning-hooks: Nation ſhall not lift up Sword againſt Nation, neither ſhall they learn War any more. The Wolf alſo ſhall dwell with the Lamb, Iſa. 2. 4. *and the Leopard ſhall lie down with the Kid; and the Calf and the young Lion, and the Fatling together: And the Lion ſhall eat* Iſa. 11. 6, 7, 8. *Straw like the Ox; and the ſucking Child ſhall play on the Hole of the Aſp; and the weaned Child ſhall put his Hand on the Cockatrice Den.* Such a Change ſhall be made, that thoſe who before were fierce and furious ſhall be then gentle and harmleſs: And this Temper ſhall prevail, and extend as far as the Chriſtian Church ſhall extend: It follows, *They ſhall not hurt nor* V. 9. *deſtroy in all my holy Mountain: For the Earth ſhall be full of the Knowledge of the Lord, as the Waters cover the Sea.* The *Meſſias* himſelf is called the *Prince of Peace:* Iſa 9. 6, 7 And it follows, *Of the Increaſe of his Government and Peace there ſhall be no End.* 'Tis expreſly ſaid, that in the Days of the *Meſſias, They ſhall ſit every Man under his Vine, and under his Fig-tree, and none ſhall* Micah 4. 4. *make them afraid. For the Mouth of the Lord of Hoſts hath ſpoken it.* Moreover 'tis ſaid of the *Meſſias*, that he *ſhould ſpeak* Zech 9. 10. *Peace unto the Heathen.* I might reckon up more Prophecies to this purpoſe.

But

But how were theſe Predictions (will the *Jew* ſay) fulfilled in our *Jeſus*? His Followers were not only perſecuted from the beginning by the *Jews*, but afterward by the *Gentiles* alſo: And when they were freed from their avowed Enemies they fell foul upon one another. They have divided into Parties and Factions; and by their Quarrels and bloody Wars have weakened themſelves, and rendred themſelves an eaſie Prey to the common Enemy. The Church of *Chriſt* hath been ſo far from not learning War any more, that thoſe very Men, that have claimed the Title of *Catholick* and moſt *Chriſtian*, have troubled the World with Quarrels and Contentions, and ſhed the Blood of the Followers of *Jeſus*.

v. MS. *Luſ.* n. 132 & 152. Nay furthermore (will the *Jew* ſay) *Jeſus* himſelf (to whoſe Times his Followers apply the foregoing Prophecies of the peaceable Times of the *Meſſias*) diſowns that he came to introduce Peace into the World. For he ſaith, *Think not that I am come to ſend Peace on Earth; I am not come to ſend Peace but a Sword: for I am come to ſet a Man at variance againſt his Father; and the Daughter againſt her Mother, and the Daughter-in-Law againſt her Mother-in-Law; and a Man's Foes ſhall be they of his own Houſhold.* How can this

Matth. 10. 34.

conſiſt

conſiſt with that Account which the Prophets give of the Times of the *Meſſias*, and of *Elias* who was to be his Fore-runner? of whom it is expreſly fore-told *that he ſhall turn the Heart of the Fathers to the Children, and the Heart of the Children to the Fathers.* Mal. 4. 6.

It will well become us to conſider this Matter with due Application of Mind, ſince 'tis an Objection againſt our whole Religion, and which is formed againſt *Jeſus* the Author of it.

In order to my better proceeding and ſpeaking to this Matter, I ſhall uſe the following Method.

Firſt, I will defend *Jeſus* and his Holy Religion againſt the Charge brought againſt them in the Objection mentioned above.

Secondly, I will more particularly reflect upon the Import of thoſe Prophecies out of which this Objection is formed.

Thirdly, I will ſhew how far theſe Predictions have been already fulfilled.

Fourthly, I will alſo ſhew what ground we have to hope that there will come a Time when they will be farther fulfilled.

Fifthly, I will conſider our Saviour's Words, *Matth.* 10. 34.

Laſtly,

Laſtly, I will make ſome Reflections upon the Whole, which may be of uſe to all of us, who profeſs *Chriſtianity*.

I. I will defend *Jeſus* and his Holy Religion againſt the Charge brought againſt them in the Objection before mentioned.

As to *Jeſus*, certain it is he ought not to be charged as a Diſturber of the Peace of the World: We have a different Account of him.

For he was ſo far from invading the Rights of Princes, that he was content to be ſubject to the Powers that were then in being; and whatever their Titles were, he was ſo far from calling them into queſtion, that he paid a ready Obedience and taught his Followers ſo to do. His Enemies did inſinuate, indeed, as if he had affected a Kingdom; and made uſe of that pretence to take away his Life. But that was Malice and Spite: And though *Pilate*, in the Inſcription which he put upon his Croſs, called him *King of the Jews*; yet the ſame *Pilate*, after he had diſcourſed this Matter with him, did profeſs that he could find no fault in him. Farther ſtill, our Saviour paid Tribute-money which ſtrictly was not due from him; and whereas he had not wherewith to pay it, yet

John 18. 37, 38.

yet to avoid Offence and the Suſpicion of Diſobedience, he would work a *Miracle*. As to this Matter *Jeſus* was ſufficiently tried. The *Phariſees* ſent their inſidious Diſciples on purpoſe to try him, and to entangle him if it might be. They purſue their Deſign with great Craft: *Maſter* (ſay they) *we know that thou art true, and teacheſt the way of God in truth, neither careſt thou for any Man; for thou regardeſt not the Perſon of Men.* Thus ſlily and craftily do they addreſs to our Lord; their main Queſtion follows, *Is it lawfull to give Tribute to* Cæſar *or not?* A nice Argument this was: Many things a witty Man might ſay in the Negative. *Cæſar* was an Heathen, a Foreigner, and an Uſurper: The *Jews* were under a *Theocracy*; and when they were allowed to chooſe a King, they were obliged to chooſe one of their own Nation: And he alſo was ſet apart by the Holy Oyl, or his Succeſſion was rendred unqueſtionable by his Family, and his Primo-geniture. But *Jeſus* is not to be wheedled by theſe craſty Men. He called for a *Roman* Coin, and from the Image it bore, tells them their Duty both of paying Tribute, and all other Dues to *Cæſar*: He does not reſiſt that Power that was uſed amiſs againſt himſelf, nor ſuffer his Diſciple to

Matth. 17.

Mat. 22.15.

Deut. 17.

uſe

uſe his Sword. So far was he from queſtioning the Government, and from diſturbing it. And as he did not diſturb the *State*, ſo was he far from any thing that ſpake him an Enemy to *Peace*

As to the *Church*: He was far from making any *Schiſm* or *Rent* in it. The Temple of the *Jews* was ſhortly to fall, and the appendant Rites with it; but *Jeſus* does not animate his Followers to haſten their Ruine. And though the Prieſthood that was *Aaronical* was near its End, and the Prieſts were bad Men, yet does he not invade their Rights and Properties: He is ſo far from it, that when he himſelf had cleanſed the Leper, he bids him ſhew himſelf to the *Prieſt*, *and offer the Gift that* Moſes *commanded*. He was not only perfectly obedient to the Ordinances of *Moſes*, but he complied, without diſputing, with the innocent Rites and Uſages, which did obtain among the *Jews*, tho' they were not required of them by the Letter of the Law of *Moſes*. He did not only go to the Feaſts, which were preſcribed by the Law, but to that of the *Dedication* which was introduced in *After-times*. He was not only circumciſed, according to the *Jewiſh* Law, but when he was about the Age of thirty Years was baptized alſo by *John Baptiſt*, according

Matth 8.4.

Joh. 10.22

to

to the Uſage that then obtained. He complied with the Rites that were innocent, though introduced without the Warranty of the Letter of the Law. Thus we find that he *ſung an Hymn* at the Cloſe of the Paſſeover, and did eat it ſitting, or at leaſt in the Poſture of thoſe who did eat at their Meals, though neither of theſe were required by the Law, or recommended by the Example of thoſe who did eat the firſt Paſſeover in *Egypt*. Matth. 26 30

Jeſus was a great Example of thoſe Vertues which tend to the begetting and promoting Peace in the World. He led an innocent and harmleſs, an uſefull and profitable Life. He went about doing good, and obliging Mankind. He did no Injury, and frankly forgave thoſe who were his Enemies. He was profoundly humble, meek and lowly in Heart, patient and content: He had a great Concern and Charity for others, but purſued no worldly Deſign of his own. No Man can juſtly charge him as unpeaceable.

And for his Holy *Religion*, 'tis like its Author, not only *pure*, but *peaceable* alſo.

The *Principles* and Doctrines of it tend to Peace and Unity, not only as it commends the Worſhip of one God, and the acknowledging but one Mediator, but alſo

as

as it teacheth us that there is but one
Eph. 4. *Body*, and one *Spirit*, one *Hope* of Eternal Life, but one *Lord*, one *Faith*, one *Baptiſm*, as well as one *God* and Father of all, who is *above all*, and *through all*, and *in all*. Here are great Endearments to each other, and a Foundation laid in the *Chriſtian* Doctrine for the moſt laſting Peace and Unity. We are Members of
Rom. 12. 5. the ſame myſtical Body: *We are one Body in Chriſt, and every one Members one of another.* Though we are otherwiſe *many*,
1 Cor. 10. 17. 12. 27. yet are we *one Body*; and that too the *Body* of Chriſt, and *Members in particular*. But there is One *Spirit* alſo. *For by one*
1 Cor. 12. 13. *Spirit are we all baptized into one Body.* We have the *ſame* Hope, and ought therefore to have the ſame Aim, and the ſame Heart. Our *Lord* and our *Faith*, as well as our *Baptiſm*, Our *God* and *Father* are one. This is the Doctrine of our Holy Religion, the very Articles whereof recommend to us Peace and Unity and great Care and Tenderneſs for one another.

And ſo do its *Poſitive Inſtitutions* alſo. By *Baptiſm* we are entred into Chriſt's Church and made Members of his myſtical Body: Hence we become obliged to *keep the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace.* And 'tis very fitly applied by the Apoſtle to that purpoſe.

For

For the other Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper*, 'tis the greateſt Inſtrument of Peace and Unity imaginable. The very outward Symbols inſinuate this Unity, the End of its Inſtitution recommends it, and the Hope of Benefit by it exacts it at our Hands. 'Tis a Feaſt of Love, a Commemoration of the greateſt Charity of our Lord and Maſter, and of the Propitiation which he made by the Sacrifice of himſelf. We are not fit for it if we be not perfectly reconciled to each other; we ſhall in that Caſe be ſo far from receiving any Benefit from it, that we ſhall bring a Curſe upon our ſelves. We muſt purge out the Leaven of Malice: If we be ſowred with it we ſhall eat and drink Damnation to our ſelves.

For the *Precepts* of the *Chriſtian* Religion, they directly tend to the procuring and promoting *Peace* and *Unity*.

Theſe things are recommended in our Holy Religion as our Duty. Our Saviour pronounceth a Bleſſing upon the *Peace-makers*: And we are elſe-where required, *if it be poſſible, as much as lieth in us, to live peaceably with all Men*: And to *follow after the things which make for Peace*: And that we *ſtudy to be quiet*; and *ſeek Peace and enſue it*.

Matt. 5. 9.

Rom. 12. 18. 14. 19. 1 Theſ. 4. 11. 1 Pet. 3. 11.

And with reſpect to the Church, we are required to preſerve the Peace and
1 Cor. 1. 10. Unity of it: *To ſpeak the ſame thing, that there be no Diviſions or Schiſms*, but that we be *perfectly joined together in the ſame Mind, and in the ſame Judgment*; we are
Phil. 2. 3. to take great care that *nothing be done through Striſe or Vain glory*: That we be
Rom. 15. 5. *like-minded*, that we *may with one Mind*,
Jude v. 19. *and one Mouth glorifie God*. There is a Mark upon thoſe that ſeparate themſelves; and 'tis expreſly commanded that we
Heb. 10. 25. ſhould not *forſake the aſſembling our ſelves together*.

Moreover our Holy Religion is full of ſuch Precepts as tend to the procuring and promoting Peace in the World. Such are the Precepts that require us to do juſtly, and as we would be done by: To ſhew Mercy to the Miſerable; to be kind and courteous, and tender-hearted; to be contented with what we have, and patient and meek, of an humble and lowly Heart; to ſeek Heaven and Spiritual things, and to be looſe to this World. Theſe things tend to Peace.

And ſo do ſuch as follow: The doing no wrong, ſpeaking evil of no Man: The forgiving and forbearing each other. The doing our own Buſineſs: The labouring honeſtly to get our own Bread: The being

ing ſubject to Higher Powers. We are alſo commanded to be gentle to all Men, to forbear threatning, raſh and long Anger, all cenſuring and judging our Brother: To be converted and become as little Children; not to put our ſelves before other Men, nor ſeek the higheſt Places.

As we hope for the Kingdom of Heaven, we are obliged to obey theſe Precepts; and as we would avoid Eternal and Unſpeakable Miſery.

But I proceed to conſider,

II. The Import of thoſe Prophecies out of which this Objection is formed. And for the better comprehending this Matter I ſhall deſire the following Particulars may be conſidered.

1. That theſe Predictions do foretell the *Tendency* of the Goſpel: And that it does tend towards Peace and Concord, I have abundantly ſhewed before. And if the *Meſſias* be called the *Prince of Peace*, I have ſufficiently made it appear that our *Jeſus* was a conſpicuous Example of Peaceableneſs and Good will. It is very certain that the *Example* and the *Doctrine* of *Jeſus* were ſuch as if they were complied with, they would introduce Peace and Good-will among Men. And that

may well be predicted as a thing which will come to paſs, when it naturally follows from what did really come to paſs. God by ſending *Jeſus* into the World made way for that Peace which the Prophets predicted; and that might well be predicted as an *Event*, when care was taken to bring thoſe things to paſs from whence it ſhould reſult. *I have purged thee* (ſays God to *Iſrael*) *and thou waſt not purged*, i.e. all was done that was fit on God's part towards the purging them, but yet through their own Neglect they were not purged in the Event of things.

Ezek. 24. 13.

2. Theſe words of the Prophets do alſo declare the *Duty* of all thoſe who embrace the Doctrine of the *Meſſias*. *They ſhall beat their Swords into Plow-ſhares: Neither ſhall they learn War any more.* The Expreſſion (as it lies in the *Hebrew*) does not neceſſarily imply the *Event*, it may be enough that it intimates the *Duty* of them who are ſpoken of. And to that purpoſe we are to conſider that after the words above named (*Iſa.* 11. 4.) there follows an Exhortation to our Duty (*v.* 5.) *O Houſe of* Jacob, *come ye, and let us walk in the Light of the Lord.*

Iſa. 11. 4.

3. Theſe Prophecies are to be underſtood to extend no farther than true *Chriſtianity* ſhould be received and ſpread in the

the World. For they being Predictions of the Days of *Meſſias*, they are to be confined to his Kingdom in the World. Now certain it is, that the Power of *Chriſtianity* hath not prevailed over the World ſince it was firſt made known: And where this Religion hath been profeſſed, yet it hath been a bare and empty Title. And as that alone gives us no Right to the Bleſſings of *Chriſtianity*, ſo it cannot be enough to ſecure Peace and Unity among the Profeſſors of it. But as we hope for the Advancement of *Chriſt*'s Kingdom (of which I ſhall ſpeak afterwards) ſo we have reaſon to believe that Peace and Unity will prevail more and more. *They will not hurt or deſtroy, when the Earth ſhall be full of the Knowledge of the Lord, as the Waters cover the Sea.* We doubt not of an Univerſal Peace; but that muſt not be expected till the Kingdom of Chriſt ſhall firſt ſpread it ſelf over the World. In the Days of the *Meſſias* ſhall the *Righteous flouriſh*, and *Abundance of Peace ſo long as the Moon endureth*: But this is not to be expected till that Bleſſed Time ſhall come, *when he ſhall have Dominion from Sea to Sea, and from the River to the Ends of the Earth*, (Pſ. 72. 7, 8.) Then will the *Chariot* and the *Horſe* and the *Battel-bow* be cut off, and then ſhall he *ſpeak*

Peace to the Heathen (Zech. 9. 10.) We are not to expect Peace without Righteouſneſs: When that returns, and the Kingdoms of the World become the Kingdoms of *Chriſt*, we juſtly expect abundance of Peace: When *Judgment ſhall dwell in the Wilderneſs, and Righteouſneſs remain in the fruitfull Field. The Work of Righteouſneſs ſhall be Peace, and the effect of Righteouſneſs quietneſs and aſſurance for ever.* Then ſhall the People of God *dwell in a peaceable Habitation, and in ſure Dwellings and in quiet reſting Places*, (Iſa. 32. 16.)

4. It is enough that theſe Predictions be made good in any part of the Days of the *Meſſias*. 'Tis ſaid, indeed, that theſe things ſhall be in the *laſt Days*, by which Expreſſion is meant the Days of the *Meſſias*: But it is all one, as to the main queſtion, whether theſe things happen in the beginning of the Days of the *Meſſias*, in the Middle, or not till the End of his Days. Whatever happens within the Compaſs of *his* Kingdom, may be ſaid to come to paſs in the *laſt Days*.

For though all the Time of the *Meſſias*, with reſpect to the Oeconomy of *Moſes*, and the *Jewiſh* Polity, is call'd the laſt Days, yet is this no Objection againſt what I am now pleading for: Becauſe whatever happens in any part of the Days of the *Meſſias*,

Meſſias, muſt be allowed to come to paſs in the *laſt days*; and if it come to paſs toward the End of that Period of Time, it doth more peculiarly belong to the *laſt Days*. For the Days of the *Meſſias* take in a great Period of Time: And though the *Jews* have among their Doctors different Opinions how long the Days of *Meſſias* ſhould continue before the Reſurrection, yet it is allowed by ſeveral of them, that his Days ſhould continue ſome Thouſands of Years. And as what falls out in any part of his Time may be ſaid to fall out in the laſt Days, ſo what comes to paſs toward the End of it, may more eſpecially be ſaid ſo to do. Suppoſing then any part of the Predictions concerning the peaceable Days of the *Meſſias* not yet to be fulfilled, this will be no Objection againſt *Jeſus*, or his *Religion*: Becauſe they may yet be farther accompliſhed before the Expiration of that Period of Time, within the Compaſs whereof they were to come to paſs. For as it is no Objection againſt the Ancient Prophecies that ſome of them are not yet fulfilled, (as the *Jews* do own *they* are not which foretell their Deliverance and Reſtauration) becauſe they may yet be accompliſhed: So is it no Objection againſt *Jeſus*, that ſome things are not yet fully accom-

Abarbanel in Dan. fol. 80.

pliſhed that were to happen in ſome part or other of the Days of the *Meſſias*.

III. I ſhall ſhew how far theſe Predictions have been already fulfilled.

That they have in good Meaſure been fulfilled is undeniable. Before the Coming of *Jeſus*, and the planting his Holy Religion in the World, there were great Heats, and Feuds, and Diſtances, and many Wars and Contentions in the World. The *Jew* was hated and deteſted by the *Gentiles*; and they by the *Jews* no better eſteemed than Dogs. They ſtood at great Diſtance, and were ſeparated by certain Rites and Inſtitutions which kept up that Diſtance and Separation from each other. This Enmity was removed by the *Death* Eph. 2. 15. and *Doctrine* of *Jeſus*, who made Peace not only between God and Man, but alſo between the *Jew* and *Gentile*: He threw down the Wall of Partition that did ſeparate them from each other. The fore-runner of *Jeſus* did by his Doctrine diſpoſe Men for Peace; and ſo did *Jeſus*, as hath been ſeen. And this was effected after the Day of *Pentecoſt*, when the *Holy Ghoſt* was poured forth miraculouſly upon the Followers of *Jeſus*. Then all Believers (whatever their Diſtances were before) kept cloſe together, and had all things in common; they

they continued with *one Accord*. And after this we read that the *Multitude of them that believed, were of one Heart and of one Soul.* Acts 2. 42, 44, 46. 4. 32.

And when God had fully declared his Mind that he would receive the *Gentiles* into his Church, the *Jews* on that Account *glorified God, ſaying, Then hath God alſo to the* Gentiles *granted Repentance unto Life.* And the *Gentiles* on the other Hand abundantly ſhewed their Kindneſs to the *Jews*. They ſent great Relief to their Poor, and entertained them with the greateſt Humanity and Kindneſs. Acts 11. 18.

The firſt *Chriſtians* were pointed at for their ſingular Love to one another, and however they were by ſome Evil Men traduced as Diſturbers of the World, were notwithſtanding very remarkable for their peaceable Temper and Converſation.

They diſturbed not the Quiet of the Places where they lived: They ſubmitted to the Powers that were in Being. Their Holy Religion rendred them modeſt and inoffenſive: Whatever they were before they embraced *Chriſtianity*, they were after that gentle and innocent. The *Wolf* became a *Lamb*, the *Leopard* a *Kid*, and the devouring *Lion* as *gentle* as a *Calf*. Let us hear what ſome of the Ancient Writers report of this Matter. *Juſtin* the

Martyr

Apolog. pro Christ. l. 2. *Martyr* tells us what a Change *Christianity* made as to this Matter. Οἱ μισέλληνες ἡμεῖς καὶ ἀλληλοφόνοι, &c. *We* (says he) *that hated and murdered each other, and who, by our Rules, which obtained among us, refused to eat at a common Table with Strangers, now, after the appearing of Christ, are conversing familiarly together, and praying for our Enemies, and endeavouring to pacifie those that unjustly hate us, that they living according to the Excellent Precepts of Christ, may with us have good hope to partake of good things from God the great Lord of the Universe.* Before the Coming of *Christ*, the World was full of War and Slaughter: But from the Days of *Augustus* (when *Jesus* was born) the Case was far otherwise, ἐξ ἐκείνου δὴ, &c. *i. e. From that Time* (says *Eusebius*) *to this* (speaking of his own Time) *we see not, as formerly, Cities and Nations fighting with each other, nor our Lives worn out with Hurry or Disturbance: Who may not therefore justly wonder that when of Old the Devils Tyranized over Mankind, and were greatly worshipped by them, that then, as possessed by them, they were furiously engaged in War with each other: So that the* Greeks, Egyptians, Syrians *and* Romans *fell into Wars within themselves. They captivated and besieged their own Country-men, as Ancient*

Præpar. l. 1. c. 4.

Stories

Stories report. But (ſays he) *by the appearing of the holy and moſt peaceable Doctrine of our Saviour, the Errour of Polytheiſm was deſtroyed, and an End was put to the Miſchiefs of Diſſentions; which I judge* (ſays he) *to be a great Demonſtration of the Divine and Unſpeakable Power of our Saviour.*

To what hath been ſaid I may add, that as upon the Birth of *Jeſus*, the Angel brought *the Tidings of great Joy to all People*, and the Heavenly Hoſt praiſed God, and ſaid, *Glory to God in the higheſt, and on Earth Peace, Good-will towards Men*; ſo did *Jeſus* leave his Peace with his Followers upon his leaving the World. *Peace I leave with you, my Peace I give unto you Not as the World giveth give I unto you.* And as he left his Peace to his Followers, ſo do they enjoy it. All that are truly ſuch do live in Peace and love it: And whatever Diſturbances they meet with from abroad, they are at Peace among themſelves: They have *Peace with God*, and with each other, and are poſſeſſed with an inward Peace which paſſeth all Underſtanding.

Luke 11. 10, 14.

Joh 14.27.

Rom. 5. 1.

Fourthly, I proceed to ſhew what ground we have to hope that there will come a Time when the Predictions of the peaceable Days IV.

Days of the *Meſſias* will be farther fulfilled. But before I proceed I ſhall premiſe.

(1.) That I do not lay the Streſs of the whole Cauſe between the *Chriſtians* and *Jews* upon this ground of a farther Completion of the Prophecies above-named. We have ground enough to believe *Jeſus* to be the *Chriſt*, without it. For as the *Jews* had ſufficient ground to believe *Moſes* a Prophet ſent by God, before his Prediction of the *Jews* diſperſion came to paſs; ſo have we to believe *Jeſus*, ſuppoſing ſome Promiſes relating to the more peaceable State of the Church not yet made good. And therefore I do not urge this Matter as that whereon the ſtreſs of the queſtion lies.

(2.) I do not therefore think my ſelf obliged operoſely to treat of this Argument: For beſides that the main of the Cauſe does not depend upon it, this would be too great a Digreſſion in this Place: For this Argument alone would take up a Volume. Beſides, there are many *Chriſtians* have done it already; and others, I hope, are purſuing the ſame Excellent Deſign.

(3.) That, notwithſtanding what hath been ſaid, the ſhewing that we have ground to hope for a more peaceable and proſperous State of the Church, will be

of

of good Uſe in this Controverſie between us and the *Jews*. For as ſuch a State when it happens will be of uſe to ſilence the *Jews*, and take from them the occaſion of their upbraiding us with our Wars and Diſſentions; ſo will the good ground of this Belief very much abate the force of their Pretenſions againſt our Religion upon that Account. And whatever effect it may have upon the *Jews*, it will be of good Uſe to thoſe weak *Chriſtians*, who are at preſent greatly offended at the ſad and deformed Condition of the Church of *Chriſt*.

Upon theſe Conſiderations, it is fit ſomething ſhould be ſaid of this Matter; though I am not oblig'd to enlarge upon it.

It is highly probable that theſe Predictions will be farther fulfilled, if it be duly conſidered,

1. What we read to this purpoſe in the Ancient Prophets. Great things indeed are foretold of the peaceable Days of the *Meſſias*, which may farther be fulfilled. 'Tis foretold of the Days of the *Meſſias*, That they ſhall *not learn War any more*; that *they ſhall not hurt nor deſtroy*. The *Meſſias* is not only called the *Prince of Peace*; but it follows, *of the Increaſe of his Government and Peace* there ſhall be *no* Iſa. 11. 4. 11. 9. 9. 6, 7.

End

End. There will come a Time, not only
Iſa. 32. 17. when *Judgment ſhall dwell in the Wilder-*
18. *neſs*, &c. But *when the Work of Righteouſ-*
neſs ſhall be Peace, and the Effect of Righ-
teouſneſs, Quietneſs and Aſſurance for ever;
when the People of *God ſhall dwell in a*
65. 19. *peaceable Habitation, and in ſure Dwellings,*
and in quiet reſting Places. God hath ſaid;
I will rejoyce in Jeruſalem, *and joy in my*
People, and the Voice of Weeping ſhall be no
more heard in her. The Wolf and the Lamb
—25. *ſhall feed together, and the Lion ſhall eat*
Straw like a Bullock, and Duſt ſhall be the
66. 12. *Serpent's Meat.* Again, *I will extend Peace*
to her like a River. Great indeed are God's
Promiſes made to his Church. That He
60. 20. will be her *everlaſting Light, and that the*
Days of her Mourning ſhall be ended; that
Ezek. 28. ſhe ſhall *be no more troubled* with a *prick-*
24. *ing Bryer*, or *grieving Thorn*; and be *no*
34. 22. *more a Prey.* Theſe are indeed glorious
Promiſes: Such as ſpeak the great Peace
and Security of God's People. They were
never made good to the *Jewiſh* People:
They were in great Troubles, both from
the *Babylonians*, and after their Captivity
among them: They were at laſt a Prey to
the *Roman* Power, and continue in Exile
ever ſince. Theſe Promiſes then are ſtill
to be made good, according to the *Jewiſh*
Principles. Suppoſing then theſe Promi-

ſes

ſes were made to the *Jewiſh* Church (which is by no means to be granted excluſively to the *Chriſtian*) yet were they never fulfilled to that People to whom they are ſuppoſed to be made, And yet their not being fulfilled will not be allowed to be any Objection againſt the Truth of the *Jewiſh* Religion. And if it be not, why ſhould it be any Objection againſt *Chriſtianity*, ſuppoſing them to belong to the Days of the *Meſſias*? In a word, theſe Promiſes belong to the Days of the *Meſſias*, or they do not. If they do not, they ought not to be brought as an Argument (as they are) to prove that *Jeſus* is not the *Chriſt*. And if they do, they only afford a ſufficient ground to believe that they will be farther fulfilled.

2. We have reaſon to believe that the *Chriſtian* Religion will yet make a greater Progreſs in the World; and conſequently that the Promiſes of the peaceable Days of the *Meſſias* will be farther fulfilled. For, as I have intimated before, this Abundance of Peace muſt be underſtood as the Conſequence of true *Chriſtianity*, and that 'twill obtain in Proportion to the Progreſs of ſincere *Chriſtianity* in the World. And though *Chriſtianity* (all things conſidered) did mightily prevail in the World,

yet

yet we do allow that we have good Cauſe to hope that it will farther prevail; and when ever it does, Peace and other Bleſſings will attend upon it.

We have ground to believe that the *Chriſtian* Doctrine will prevail more upon the World. God hath promiſed to give
Pſal. 2. 8. unto the *Meſſias*, the *Heathen* for his *Inheritance*, and the uttermoſt Ends of the *Earth* for his *Poſſeſſion*. It is expreſly ſaid,
Pſ. 72. 8, 11, 17. *He ſhall have Dominion from Sea to Sea, and from the River unto the Ends of the Earth: Yea all Kings ſhall fall down before him, all Nations ſhall ſerve him, all Nations ſhall call him bleſſed.* We read in the Prophet *Daniel* of one like the Son of Man coming, with the Clouds of Heaven, to
Dan. 7. 14. the Ancient of Days: *And there was given him Dominion and Glory, and a Kingdom that all People, Nations and Languages ſhould ſerve him.* I will not multiply Places to this purpoſe: Though theſe Predictions have in great Meaſure been fulfilled, yet we do eaſily yield that they will be farther fulfilled before the End of the World. And 'tis enough to our purpoſe that they be fulfilled in any part of the Days of the *Meſſias*.

3. We have alſo ground to believe that theſe glorious things were in great Meaſure to come to paſs, not in the firſt Times of

of the *Chriſtian* Church, but after that Defection and Apoſtacy of *Chriſtians*, which the Holy Writers do foretell; that is, after the Church ſhould emerge out of that corrupt State into which ſhe would fall.

For that the Church of Chriſt would lapſe into a very great Apoſtacy from ſincere and primitive *Chriſtianity*, we that are Chriſtians cannot disbelieve. And indeed the main of the *Jew*'s Objections againſt *Chriſtianity* lie not ſo much againſt the Religion, as delivered by *Jeſus* and his Followers, but as it is taught and repreſented to them during this great Apoſtacy, by thoſe who had corrupted it of the *Roman* Church. And therefore when *Abravenel* interprets the *little Horn* in *Daniel*, and the *Mouth that ſpeaks great things*, of the *Biſhop of Rome* and his *Adherents*, we have no diſpute with him upon the main Matter: We underſtand it the ſame way, with this Difference only, that he underſtands the Place of *Rome* as *Chriſtian*, and we of *Rome* as *Apoſtatized* from Primitive *Chriſtianity*. He never ſaw any Chriſtianity but what he ſaw in that Communion: And 'tis not much to be wondred he ſhould therefore ſpeak hardly of it. 'Twas in the Time of the great Apoſtacy in which that *Jew* lived and died. *Abravenel in Dan.* 7.

But as we *Chriſtians* have clear Evidence that a Defection from the Faith was foretold, ſo we have ground to hope that the Church of *Chriſt* will recover and get out of that wretched Eſtate; and that then the glorious things, predicted of the Days of the *Meſſias*, will be farther fulfilled. We do not want ground for this Hope from the Old Teſtament. The Kingdom of the *Meſſias* is predicted by *Daniel*, in his Interpretation of *Nebuchad-*
Dan 2.34. *nezzar*'s Dream. The *Stone cut out without Hands* does certainly denote the firſt planting of *Chriſt*'s Kingdom in the World. This was done indeed not only under the fourth Kingdom or *Roman* Monarchy, but in the Time of their firſt Emperours. This was the primitive Time of this Kingdom: Now was *Chriſtianity* firſt planted in the World, and *Chriſt*'s Kingdom but ſet up. This was a fair beginning indeed; but a great Defection was to happen, and did fall out, and this Kingdom was to be
Dan 2. V 41. recovered and advanced: Thus we read, *in the Days of theſe Kings*, (that is, of the ten Kings into which the *Roman* Empire was in After-times to be divided, *v.* 41. thoſe Toes of the Feet, *v.* 42.) *ſhall the God of Heaven ſet up a Kingdom which ſhall never be deſtroyed.* That is, God ſhall again reſtore and advance the Kingdom of the

the *Meſſias*, which before had been brought low through the Defection of *Chriſtians*, and this Kingdom thus reſtored ſhall never be deſtroyed. So far ſhall it be from being deſtroyed, that *it ſhall break in pieces and conſume all theſe Kingdoms.* We have in another Viſion of *Daniel* a repreſentation of the four great Monarchies under the Character of four Beaſts: The fourth whereof was that of the *Romans*; and that under the Character of a Beaſt *dreadfull*, and *terrible*, and *ſtrong exceedingly*, and *diverſe* from the foregoing: And it is ſaid to have *ten Horns*, i. e. ten Kings (*v.* 24.) Among or after theſe there came up a *little Horn*; it had *Eyes like a Man*, and a *Mouth ſpeaking great things*, (*v.* 8.) I do readily grant that this is to be underſtood of the Apoſtatized Church of *Rome*. The Character given of it (*v.* 25.) ſuits well with this Interpretation: But that which is to be conſidered to my preſent purpoſe is, that upon the Deſtruction of this *Horn*, the *Son of Man*, or the *Meſſias* is reſtored to his Kingdom: *There was given him Dominion and Glory, and a Kingdom, that all People, Nations and Languages ſhould ſerve him. His Dominion is an everlaſting Dominion, which ſhall not paſs away, and his Kingdom that which ſhall not be deſtroyed.* Upon the

Dan. 7.

V. 14.

Judgment paſt, and the Execution of the
V. 27. Sentence upon this little Horn, *The Kingdom and Dominion, and the Greatneſs of the Kingdom under the whole Heaven ſhall be given to the People of the Saints of the moſt high.* And whereas 'tis ſaid among the *Jews*, that *after the Deſtruction of* Rome *comes the* Meſſias, We ſhall not deny a convenient Senſe of it. We do hope that when the Power of *Rome*, as Anti-chriſtian, is deſtroyed, the Kingdom of the *Meſſias* will be exalted, and his Holy Religion greatly ſpread and advanced in the World.

Abravanel in Dan. *fol.* 4. *p.* 2. *Col.* 2.

Much more might be ſaid in this Matter to convince *Chriſtians* of the ground we have for this Hope, both from the New Teſtament, and the Belief of the Ancient *Chriſtians:* But to repreſent theſe things would be too great a Digreſſion in this Place, and not ſo agreeable to the End of this Diſcourſe.

V. I ſhall now conſider our Saviour's Words, *Matth.* 10. 34. *Think not that I am come to ſend Peace on Earth; I am not come to ſend Peace but a Sword.* From hence the *Jew* would infer, that *Jeſus* was not the *Meſſias*, that Prince of Peace, of whoſe Times ſuch glorious things are predicted by the Prophets of Old. But in anſwer

to

to this pretence, I offer the following particulars. And

1. That we conſider the Context, and Deſign of the Words of *Jeſus*; He ſends his Apoſtles to preach, and ſends them, as he tells them, as *Sheep in the midſt of Wolves*. He lets them know what Treatment they muſt expect, *viz. to be delivered up to the Counſels*, to be *ſcourged in Synagogues, brought before Kings and Governours*: Moreover, that the *Brother* ſhall deliver the *Brother*, the *Father* the *Child*, and Children cauſe their Parents to be put to death. So great a Rage will the Unbelievers fall into upon the preaching the *Chriſtian* Doctrine: It will expoſe the Preachers to the hatred of Mankind. *Jeſus* arms his Followers againſt theſe Trials, and lets them know that they will certainly meet with them, if they perſevere in the conſtant Profeſſion of the Truth. He would not have them flatter themſelves with a vain Opinion, that they ſhould be able to perſwade all Men to receive their Doctrine: They would find many reject it, and ſome of their Kindred and Relatives among them, who would thereupon withdraw from them, and treat them hardly. They muſt not therefore deſiſt, but be ſtedfaſt, and know he deſigned not his Followers ſhould comply with the Matth. 10. v. 16. 17, 18. 21, 22.

Enemies of his Truth: He designed not to set on Foot such a wicked and ungodly Peace in the World, but rather to denounce and bid defiance to these perverse Opposers of the *Christian* Doctrine. This is the Scope of our Saviour's Words.

2. That the word *Sword* does not in this place denote *Wars* or *Fightings*, but *Division* and *Separation* from one another upon Account of Religion. And this is evident from the following words here, and from a parallel Place. For the following words are these, *For I am come* (not to animate my Followers to Blood and Slaughter, but) διχάσαι, to separate Son and Father, &c. one rejecting, and the other receiving my Holy Doctrine. The parallel Place instead of *Sword* hath *Division*. *Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on Earth? I tell you, nay, but rather* Division: Διαμέρισμον There cannot be any Concord between Light and Darkness, between *Christ* and *Belial*: The Sword which *Christ* sends was not to *murther* but to *part*, not to slay but to separate the precious from the vile. If all had received the Truth, there would have followed no Division: *Christ's* Sword is the Word of God, the Sword of the Spirit, which *divides asunder* indeed, but sheds no Blood. Christ sent a Sword χωρίζου-

Mat. 10. 35.

Separare. V. L.

Luk. 12. 15.

Separationem, V. L.

Bellum missum est bonum ut rumperetur pax mala, Hieron.

Οὕτω τὸν λόγον ἐρημάτισε, *Chrysostom.* Heb. 4. 12.

σαν

σαν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπίστων, i. e. *that divides us from Infidels*, but by no means puts us upon Slaughter, much leſs upon killing one another. Theodor. Heraclest. in Mat. 10. 34.

3. That whatever *Evil* follows upon preaching the *Chriſtian* Doctrine, *Chriſt* was not the Cauſe of it, nor his Doctrine. I have before vindicated *Jeſus*, and his Holy Religion: 'Tis certain that all the bad Effects and Conſequents are to be imputed to the Wickedneſs of Unbelievers. Οὐκ αὐτὸς πάντα ἐποίει, ἀλλ' ἡ ἀπίστων πονηρία· *Jeſus* is *not the Author of them, but the Wickedneſs of Unbelievers*. Whatever *occaſion Jeſus* or his Holy Religion might be, they were not the *Cauſe* of any Evil. 'Tis he that denies or oppoſeth the Truth that brings the Miſchief upon himſelf and others. This will be very plain to him that will take the pains to conſider what hath been ſaid before in defence of *Jeſus* and his *Religion*. Whatever Evils followed upon ſpreading the *Chriſtian* Doctrine were accidental: And if the World were turn'd upſide down, the Charge could not juſtly be brought againſt the *Chriſtian* Doctrine, or the Preachers of it: They were thoſe who oppoſed it, that cauſed all the Miſchief that happened. Chryſoſt. in Mat. 10. 34.

4. Nor do the words of *Jeſus*, *I am not come to ſend Peace but a Sword*, denote his

deſign and the *purpoſe* of his Coming, but the *event* of things. All that can be inferred is the Certainty of the thing, or that it will as ſurely come to paſs as if he had deſigned it. We are in interpreting ſuch Places as theſe to conſider the particular Manner of ſpeaking in uſe among theſe Ancient Writers: And we ſhall by doing ſo find, that all that the words import is the certain Futurity of the thing. *Simeon* ſaid of *Jeſus this* Child *is ſet for the*
Luk. 2 34. *fall and riſing again of many in* Iſrael; *and for a ſign which ſhall be ſpoken againſt.* Where 'tis evident the words denote not the *deſign*, but *event*: And they denote no more than this, when the *Greek* Particle ἵνα (which elſewhere denotes the Deſign of the Agent, or the final Cauſe) is uſed. *For Judgment* (ſays Jeſus) *I am*
Joh. 9. 39. *come into this World; that they which ſee not might ſee, and that they which ſee might be made blind.* In which words is expreſſed, not the *deſign* but *event* of *Chriſt's*
Rom. 5 20. *Coming.* Again, *The law entred,* ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα, *that the Offence might abound.* This was not the *deſign* of the Law's entring, but the *event* or *conſequent* only. And if where this Particle *is*, the words import no more than the *event*, there is leſs reaſon they ſhould import more where it *is not*; and it *is not* in the words of *Jeſus*, Matth. 10. 34. I will

I will now make ſome Reflections upon the whole, which may be of uſe to all of us, who profeſs *Chriſtianity*. VI.

1. We ſee the true Method of coming to a right Judgment of Religion. We are to conſider its Principles, its Tendency, and its Motives of Credibility; and as it is in it ſelf, and in its naked Purity, not as it is repreſented by partial Men, or as 'tis exemplified by the Lives of many of the Profeſſors of it. This is the fault of the *Jews*, they judge of *Chriſtianity* by *Chriſtians*, of *Jeſus* by his Followers, and of the whole Cauſe by a falſe Meaſure. I muſt confeſs that if I knew no *Chriſtianity* but what is to be found in ſome parts of the Church of *Rome*, or did I know no more of it than as 'tis repreſented in ſome Books; perhaps it would be the laſt Religion I ſhould chooſe. A Man would be tempted to believe *Jeſus* was not the *Prince* of *Peace*, when he beholds the Fightings and Quarrels of his profeſſed Followers: He would ſuſpect the Religion as no friend to Peace that looks no farther than to the Schiſms and Contentions of thoſe who profeſs it. But this is not the way to come at the Truth. All we can infer is that ſuch Contentious and Evil Men are not *Chriſtians*; and whatever they profeſs, that

that they are not the genuine Diſciples of *Jeſus*. 'Tis unjuſt to charge the faults of falſe People upon the Religion or the Author of it: Eſpecially when the Books, where this Religion is taught, give us notice of a great Defection from primitive *Chriſtianity* that ſhould happen in the World.

2. We may judge from what hath been ſaid, whether our Religion hath gained its End upon us or not, or whether we have receiv'd the Grace of God in vain. Hath it rendred us gentle, of eaſie Acceſs, harmleſs and of a Lamb-like diſpoſition? Hath it filed off the roughneſs and fierceneſs of our Temper, all Cruelty and proneneſs to Rapacity, the Wolfiſh and Lyon-like diſpoſition, and turn'd us into the innocence and inoffenſiveneſs of a Lamb or little Child! This Change it does make where-ever it prevails in Power. And where-ever 'tis profeſſed, and does not mend our Temper and new mould us, we receive it in vain. 'Twas deſigned to mend our Tempers, and to pare away all that Superfluity of Naughtineſs by which we are rendred leſs uſefull and leſs converſable with our Fellow-creatures. *Jeſus* did not ſtrive, nor lift up his Voice on high. His Doctrine is deſign'd to render us peaceable, and eaſie to be intreated.

3. We

3. We ſee what need we have to live at Peace with each other, and to preſerve Unity as much as may be in the Church of *Chriſt*. Our Quarrels, and unneceſſary Separations from one another do not only much miſchief *within* the Church, but *without* it too. They tempt the *Jew* to reject the whole Religion, and to impute to that what is only to be charged upon our ſelves. Good God awaken us all to a due Senſe of this Matter, and grant that we may prefer the Unity of the Church, and the Intereſt of our common *Chriſtianity*, before our own Particularities, and private Opinions! Nothing ſo ill becomes us as Strife and Debate, Quarrels and Schiſms. Our Holy Religion puts us upon a vigorous Purſuit of Peace and Unity. For the gaining whereof 'twill be worth our while to part with very much: For by keeping our Breaches wide we endanger the whole. 'Tis high time to mind *the things that belong to peace*, as well as thoſe by which we may be able to *edifie one another*.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

The CONTENTS.

A Defence of the Writers of the New Teſtament againſt ſome other Objections of J. Aben Amram. *His Objection againſt* Matth. 12. 3, 4. *anſwered. An Anſwer to his Objection againſt* Luke 4. 25. *His Objection againſt the Words of* Jeſus *in* Mark 10 19. *An Anſwer to that Objection. An Objection againſt* Jeſus *for deſtroying the Herd of Swine,* Mat. 8. v. 32. *an Anſwer to it. The* Jews *Objections againſt* Jeſus *for not making good his Promiſe,* Matt. 26. 32. *and againſt the Credibility of the Hiſtory of his Aſcenſion. An Anſwer to theſe Objections. The* Jews *Objections againſt the Words of* Jeſus, *John* c. 16. v. 7, *and* v. 13. *An Anſwer to thoſe Objections. His Objections againſt the Evangeliſts relating our Saviour's keeping the Paſſeover juſt before his Death. The* Jew *pretends that the Relation is inconſiſtent and incredible: An Anſwer at large to the* Jews *Pretences. His Objection againſt the Relation of* Pilate's *waſhing his Hands, anſwered. An Anſwer to his Objection concerning the Weight of the*

the Myrrh *and* Aloes, *John* 19. v. 39. *An Answer to his Objection against* Matt. 28. 18. *His Objection against* John c. 21. v. 25. *A Defence of that Evangelist against the* Jew's *Assaults. The* Jew *objects against the Words of St.* Paul, *Gal.* c. 3. v. 10. *A Defence of St.* Paul. *He objects against the Author of the Epistle to the* Hebrews, *for those words which are found,* ch. 9. v. 19. *A Defence of that Divine Author. His Objection against the Epistle of St.* James. *An Answer to his Objection.*

AFTER I had finished my *second* part of this Book against the *Jews*, and made it publick, a Friend lent me a *MS.* written by a *Jew* against the *Christian* Religion, bearing the Title of *Porta Veritatis:* The Author goes under the Name of *Jacob Aben Amram.* In that *MS.* I find a great many Objections against the Writings of the New Testament; and among them some which had not been considered before, and that required a more particular consideration. And not knowing into what Hands that *MS.* might come, I thought fit to consider those Objections in this place, rather than to let them go without any Answer at all.

The

I. The *Firſt* Objection, which I met with in that Author, in that part of his *MS.* where he treats of this Matter *ex profeſſo*, is againſt the words of *Jeſus* reported by St. *Matthew*, ch. 12. v. 3, 4. *Have ye not read what* David *did, when he was hungred, and they that were with him; how he entred into the Houſe of God, and did eat the Shew-bread, which was not lawfull for him to eat, neither for them which were with him*, &c. The *Jew* objects that theſe words cannot be true, becauſe *David* was alone; which he attempts to prove from the words of the Prieſt, where this Paſſage is related, *Why art thou alone, and no Man with thee?* 1 Sam. 21. 1.

J. Ab. Am-Fort. Verit. Artic. III. *par.* 3. *de Laboribus Evangel. Num.* 933.

He concludes thence that *David* fled *alone*; and that *he only* eat of the Shew-bread: And therefore it ought not to have been ſaid by *Jeſus*, *and they that were with him.* He concludes that *Jeſus* and the Evangeliſts were deceived in this Matter of Fact; but yet he is ſo courteous as to allow, that perhaps it might ſo happen by occaſion of the words, 1 *Sam.* 21. v. 2. *I have appointed my Servants to ſuch and ſuch a place.* We need not this courteſie. I ſhall defend *Jeſus* and the Evangeliſts from the *Jews* charge. And I anſwer,

1. That

1. That *David* did appear *alone* before the Prieſt, cannot be denied; nor does *Jeſus* ſay any thing that contradicts it. He ſays that he (i. e. *David*) *entred into the Houſe of God.* And *Doeg*, in his Accuſation, mentions *David* only. *I ſaw the Son of Jeſſe*, ſays he, 1 *Sam.* 22. 9. And this agrees with what we read, 1 *Sam.* 21. 1.

2. But then it is as evident alſo that he had company in that his Journey or Flight, even from the Text of *Samuel.* He asked for Five Loaves of Bread, or at leaſt what the Prieſt had to ſpare. The Prieſt tells him he had no common Bread, but that he had hallowed Bread; which indeed was to be eaten, according to the Law, by hallowed Perſons; at leaſt it was not fit it ſhould be eaten by thoſe who were under any Legal Uncleanneſs: And therefore the Prieſt expreſſeth his caution, in thoſe words, *if the young Men have kept themſelves at leaſt from Women:* (See *Exod.* 19. 15.) by which it appears that this Bread would be eaten by *David*, and his Companions alſo. By the young Men muſt be meant *David*'s Companions, as appears from his reply; *Of a truth* (ſays *David*) *Women* have been *kept from us about theſe three Days ſince I came out; and the Veſſels of the young Men are holy*, &c. By which Anſwer *David* ſatisfied the Scru-

ple

ple of the Prieſt, who feared leſt ſome of his Company might eat of the hallowed Bread under ſome Legal Defilement. Upon this he gives *David* the hallowed Bread for the uſe of himſelf and his Company, in their great Neceſſity.

3. Hence it appears that the *Jew* is very impudent in his Charge, againſt *Jeſus* and his Evangeliſt, whereas they *have* not in any kind miſ-reported the Hiſtory as it lies in the Book of *Samuel*. He affirms that *David* only did *eat*; but *Samuel* does not ſay ſo. His words imply that the Holy Bread was given to *David*, not only for his own eating, but for the uſe of them that were with him, *Mark* 2. 26. Indeed the *Jew* on this occaſion falls upon *Mark* for miſ-naming this Prieſt, and calling him *Abiathar*; but I have elſe-

Part II. *pag.* 188. where given an Account of that Matter.

II. The ſame Author objects againſt the words in St. *Luke* ch. 4. 25. *in the Days of* Elias, *when the Heavens were ſhut up three Years and ſix Months*, where *Jeſus* ſpeaks of the Time of Drought in the Days of *Elias*; whereas that Drought did not continue full three Years, as appears from 1 *King.* 18. 1. where it is ſaid that th *Word of the Lord came to* Elijah *in the third Year*. I anſwer,

Id. Ibid. n. 994.

Th

The whole Streſs of this Objection is derived from what is related, 1 *King.* 18. 1. And therefore I am obliged very particularly to conſider thoſe words; and then it will appear that *Jeſus* affirms nothing in St. *Luke* that is inconſiſtent with what is related in the Book of *Kings*. I will therefore conſider the words as they lie in the Book of *Kings*.

The words in the Book of *Kings* are thus tranſlated by the Engliſh. And *it came to paſs* after *many Days, that the word of the Lord came to* Elijah *in the third Year*. The words as they lie in the *Hebrew* are theſe, ויהי ימים רבים ודבר יהוה היה אל אליהו בשנה השלישית, I muſt needs join with *Grotius* who thought the words might be thus interpreted. *Dies aliquam multi* (id eſt, ſex menſes) *præterierant, ex quo Deus allocutus erat etiam anno tertio; id eſt, fine anni tertii, poſtquam pluere deſierat*, i. e. *many days paſſed* (viz. ſix Months) *from the Time when God had ſpoken to* Elias *in the third Year*, i. e. in the End of the third Year, after it had ceaſed to rain: And then the Command which *Elias* had received at the End of the third Year was to be executed ſix Months afterwards. This Interpretation quite overthrows the *Jews* Objection. I do declare ſolemnly that this Interpretati-

H. Grot. in Luc. c. 4. v. 25.

V. Waldii Concord. Partical. p. 156 & p. 279.

on of the words as they lie in the Text is very agreeable to the Text, and to the Uſe and Senſe of the *Hebrew* words and particles in other places. It would be too great a Digreſſion to bring in what might be ſaid in Confirmation of this Interpretation, which yet I ſhall be ready to do, if required. In the mean while the Marginal Quotation will furniſh the curious Reader with Store of Examples which will juſtifie this Interpretation. I do appeal to the Learned for the Account I have given of the place; nor do I ſee what the Learned *Jew* can object againſt it. I am ſure the words, as they are tranſlated by the *Engliſh*, ſeem very uncouth and ſtrange.

I very well know that much more might be ſaid upon this occaſion, and to very good purpoſe alſo; but I am ſatisfied that what hath been ſaid above is ſufficient to put the *Jew* to ſilence; nor do I care to amuſe the Reader with the ſeveral ways which *Chriſtians* have taken to anſwer this Difficulty. Our Saviour doubtleſs ſpake nothing but what was the received Opinion of the *Jews* at that time: Nor do we find that the *Jews* contradicted him in this Matter.

The

The ſame *Jew* objects what we read, *Luke* 2. 22, 23, 24. concerning the Purification of the Virgin *Mary*, the preſenting of *Jeſus*, and offering a *Sacrifice*. He thinks this Purification inconſiſtent with the Belief that the *Chriſtians* have of the immaculate Conception; and that *Jeſus* being miraculouſly born could not be ſaid to open the Womb; nor conſequently was there any need of a Sacrifice. III. *Ibid. num.* 1091.

I anſwer,

That the Legal Purifications and Sacrifices did not always imply a Guilt. Men were obliged to obey the Divine Inſtitutions; and not to have done it would have involved them in Guilt. The Virgin *Mary* was a Debtor to the Law; and our Saviour was *made of a Woman, and made under the Law.* (Gal. 4. 4.) And being really a Man and born of a Woman might truly be ſaid to open the Womb. We believe that Chriſt was *made Sin for us* (2 Cor. 5. 21.) and was *ſent in the likeneſs of ſinfull Fleſh*, (Rom. 8. 3.) And agreeably hereunto he obeyed the Law and *fulfilled all Righteouſneſs*, (Matt. 3. 15.) He was baptized, though he had no Impurity to waſh away; circumciſed he was, though he had no Superfluity of Naughtineſs to pare off. And a *Jew*, of all Men, ſhould

not object this; whereas if our Saviour had not complied with the Divine Institutions, they would not have failed to have objected that against him, and would not have wanted colour for it.

IV. This *Jew* objects against the words of *Jesus*, Mark 10. 19. A Man came to *Jesus* and asked him what he should do that he might *inherit Eternal Life: Jesus* replies, *thou knowest the Commandments, do not commit adultery, do not kill, do not steal, do not bear false witness, defraud not, honour thy Father and Mother.* The *Jew* objects against *Jesus* that he did not mention the other Precepts mentioned, *Exod.* 20. & *Deut.* 5. which are of greater moment. He thinks *Jesus* ought to have made some general mention of them, and ought not to have subjoined, *One thing thou lackest, go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast and give to the poor.* As if nothing else could be wanting, when there were a great many Precepts (which he had not named) that the Man was obliged to obey. Besides, for that *one thing*, 'tis not necessary; for many have been saved without it, as the *Christians* do not deny. I answer

Ibid. num. 1026.

1. That *Jesus*, by naming these Precepts only, cannot in Justice be supposed to excuse this Man from his Obligation to the

the other Precepts. Nothing is more common than to put ſome Precepts for the whole. The fear of God is ſometimes uſed for our whole Duty. *What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do juſtly, and to love Mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?* Says the Prophet *Micah* ch. 6. v. 8. And I hope he will not be blamed that ſaid thoſe words, though there were a Number of other Precepts in the Law of *Moſes*. But perhaps the Streſs of the *Jews* Objection may lie in this, *viz.* That when the Man inquired the way to Eternal Life, *Jeſus* ſhould mention the Precepts of the *Second Table* only, and not any of the *Firſt* which concern our Duty towards God. I therefore anſwer,

1. That *Jeſus* is not blameable upon this Account, becauſe he may be juſtified from the Old Teſtament, in this Method. *Lord who ſhall abide in thy Tabernacle, and who ſhall dwell in thy holy Hill?* Pſ. 15. 1. This is a Queſtion very like to that of the Man in the Goſpel. *David Kimchi* tells us that by the *Tabernacle* and the *holy Hill*, Heaven is meant, the State of Recompence and Bliſs to righteous Souls. Now the Anſwer to this Queſtion follows: He that walks *righteouſly* or *uprightly*, he that *does Righteouſneſs*, that *ſpeaks the Truth*. He that neither injures, backbites,

R. D. Kimchi in Pſ. 15.

or reproacheth his Neighbour, *&c.* where we find nothing mentioned but Obedience to the *Second Table*. This does not exclude the Duties of the *Firſt Table* in the *Pſalmiſt*; nor in the words of *Jeſus* may this be preſumed to do it. Thus the Prophet *Jeremy* ſpeaks to the *Jews*, *Did* not thy Father *do Judgment and Juſtice? He judged the Cauſe of the Poor and Needy; then it was well* with him: Was *not this to know me? Sayeth the Lord*, Jer. 22. 15, 16. This is ſo far from excluding the Precepts of the *Firſt Table*, that it rather implies and infers them; as appears from thoſe words, was *not this to know me?* Saith the Lord.

3. We do not doubt but rich Men have been ſaved, nor do we believe that it is abſolutely and univerſally neceſſary that we ſhould ſtrip our ſelves of all that we do poſſeſs. But we do believe we ought to be in a preparation to part with our Wealth when God declares his Will that we ſhall keep it no longer. 'Tis neceſſary that we obey *Jeſus*; and when ever the Enjoyment of our Riches becomes inconſiſtent with our Obedience to the Laws of our Holy Religion, we ought to part with them. *Jeſus* tells the Man, *one thing thou lackeſt*. And it appeared, from what follows, that here he came ſhort: He was not

not ready to part with his Riches when *Jeſus* commanded him to do it. If the *Jew* conclude from this Paſſage that all *Chriſtians* are obliged to part with their worldly Eſtates, he concludes too much. 'Tis enough that we do it as often as *Jeſus* requires it.

V. The *Jew* objects againſt what *Jeſus* did in deſtroying the Herd of Swine, *Matth.* 8. 32. He ſays, no Man ought to hurt his Neighbour; that it was a great Injury to deſtroy this great Herd which were under a Keeper. He adds, that whereas St. *Matthew* mentions two that met *Jeſus*, yet St. *Mark* and St. *Luke* mention but one, *Mark* 5. 1. *Luke* 8. 27. I anſwer, *Ibid. num.* 1028.

1. 'Tis very well known that Swine's-Fleſh was prohibited by the Law of *Moſes*. It was ſo far from being allowed for *Sacrifice*, that it was not allowed for *Food*. And how much ſoever the *Romans* valued that Fleſh, (as 'tis certain they did it at a great Rate) there was nothing that the *Jews*, who adhered to their Law, more deteſted. No Man received any good from a Swine till after its Death; but the *Jew* even then received no Advantage by it. They were ſo far from it that it was among them deteſtable, even when alive. A Nouriſher of Swine was one of an ill

Name; 'Tis in their *Talmud* reckoned as an Infamy, and reckoned among the Crimes of Drunkenneſs and Uſury. *Maimonides* reports as a ſaying of their wiſe Men, *Curſed is he that brings up Dogs and Swine, becauſe they are miſchievous.* The ſame Author tells us that their *wiſe Men forbad the bringing up of Swine in any place; but they did not thus abſolutely forbid the bringing up of Dogs.* But we have an older Author than *Maimonides* that delivers it as a *Canon* and ſetled Conſtitution among the *Jews*; I mean the Author of the *Miſna.* His words are theſe, אין מגדלין וכו׳ i. e. *They do not bring up ſmall Beaſts in the Land of* Iſrael, *&c. They do not bring up Cocks in* Jeruſalem, *&c. nor may an* Iſraelite *bring up Swine in any place, &c.* This is the Ancient Conſtitution of their wiſe Men, to which the *Jews* think themſelves obliged to pay Obedience. It hath been ſuppoſed that the *Gentiles* might keep this Herd of Swine, who lived among the *Jews*; but this is not ſufficiently proved: And granting it ſo to be, yet it muſt be allowed to be a great hardſhip upon the *Jews*, as well as a great ſnare alſo. For the *Jews* were remarkable among the *Gentiles* for their deteſtation of Swine's-Fleſh; and this Practice was an ill Example to that People, who, out of the deſire of Lucre,

Talm. Hieroſ Shekalim. Maimon. Nizke Mammon. c. 5.

Baraitha c. 7. m. 7.

cre, might be tempted to ſet up the ſame Trade; and tempted alſo to taſt of the forbidden Fleſh, out of compliance with the Gentile Practice; or to avoid their Scoffs on this Account; ſo that it was in truth an Act of Grace and Favour to the *Jews* to remove from them ſo dangerous a Snare, and ſo bad an Example.

2. I ſee no cauſe why the *Jew* ſhould charge *Jeſus* with any Injuſtice or Injury done: For it does not appear that *Jeſus* deſtroyed this Herd of Swine. The Devils beſought *Jeſus* that he would *ſuffer* them to go into the Herd of Swine; and he did permit them. *He ſuffered them* ſays St. *Luke*, c. 8. v. 32. The Devils had a natural Power to do it of themſelves, were they not reſtrained by a ſuperior Power. *Jeſus* did not think fit (and doubtleſs for great reaſon) to reſtrain them. They were the Devils which deſtroyed the Swine, not *Jeſus*. Does the *Jew* think *Jeſus* bound to interpoſe in this Matter? The good Work was his; He diſpoſſeſſed the poor Man; the Devils upon this entred into the Herd. The Man was worth the ſaving, and *Jeſus* ſaved him; He did not think fit to concern himſelf any farther. He relieved the Man, and only neglected the Swine. He preſerved the *Image* of God, but did not think the

un-

unclean and forbidden Swine worthy of his care. This is all that this mighty Charge amounts unto.

3. 'Tis great Severity in the *Jew* upon this Occaſion to cenſure our Saviour. The Miracles that *Jeſus* did were generally ſo many Reſcues and Reliefs, ſo many Acts of Mercy and Compaſſion. Thoſe which *Moſes* wrought were many times ſo many Plagues and Inflictions: And yet we do not charge *Moſes* upon that Account. We do not complain of *Elijah* for his deſtroying fifty Men at a Time; nor againſt *Eliſhah* for his Severity to the forty two Children: And 'tis very hard that the *Jew* ſhould inveigh againſt *Jeſus* for permitting the Devils to deſtroy the Herd of Swine. 'Tis true *Moſes* had a Divine Commiſſion, and the others were true Prophets, and we ought not to queſtion them. But then I have proved that we have as much ground, not to ſay very much more, to believe the Divine Miſſion of *Jeſus*, as the *Jews* have for the Divine Miſſion of *Moſes*, or any other of their Prophets.

4. For what the *Jew* objects that St. *Matthew* mentions two that met *Jeſus*, and St. *Mark* and St. *Luke* mention but one, I need not trouble my ſelf about it. For beſides that the Objection hath no Weight in it, a parallel caſe of this kind hath

hath been conſidered before, in the *Second* part of this Book. Pag. 117.

VI. The ſame *Jew* tells us that *Jeſus* ſaid to his Diſciples, a little before his Death, that after his Reſurrection from the Dead he would *go before them into* Galilee, *Matth.* 26. 32. He promiſeth the ſame after his Reſurrection, *Matth.* 28. 10. The ſame thing is predicted by an Angel, *Mark* 16. 7. that it is ſubjoined, *v.* 12. *that he appeared to two Diſciples* (in *Jeruſalem* the *Jew* adds to the Text; but in St. *Mark* it is) *as they walked and went into the Country.* After this he appeared to the Eleven, *v.* 14. (in the ſame City of *Jeruſalem* adds the *Jew*) and after his Diſcourſe ended he took his laſt Farewell of them, and he aſcended into Heaven, *v.* 14. with *v.* 19. Hence he concludes that *Jeſus* never appeared to them in *Galilee*, and that he aſcended not from *Bethany*, or Mount *Olivet*, but from the *Table* where he did eat with his Diſciples. He ſays that *Luke* does more clearly bear witneſs to this in his laſt Chapter, where he ſays nothing of *Galilee*; but on the contrary, all together, *viz.* that he only appeared in *Jeruſalem*, and *v.* 50. that he departed from his Diſciples aſcending into Heaven. He quotes *Luke* again, *Acts* 1. 12, and ſays there VI. *Ibid. num.* 1030.

there is no mention of *Galilee*, or of the Table. He adds that *John*, ch. 20. agrees with St. *Mark* and St. *Luke*, that he appeared to his Diſciples in *Jeruſalem*; but that he diſſents from them, *ch.* 21. where he affirms that he departed from his Diſciples in *Galilee*. This he reckons as inconſiſtent with what is ſaid of his aſcending from Mount *Olivet* in *Bethany*, and from the Table. He adds that *Matthew*, ch. 28. v. 16. affirms that the Diſciples went unto a Mountain in *Galilee*, as *Jeſus* had commanded, and that he mentions no Appearance in *Jeruſalem* but that to *Mary Magdalen*, in which he diſſents from the other Evangeliſts. Hence he infers that the Account is inconſiſtent, and that there is no ground to believe the Aſcenſion of *Jeſus*.

Any Man may ſee the tendency of this. He would repreſent *Jeſus* as one who was falſe to his word, and the Article of his Aſcenſion as incredible; and that the Evangeliſts deſerve no Belief, in that they ſpeak inconſiſtently with one another. I anſwer,

1. I do grant that *Jeſus* did promiſe his Diſciples that he would go before them into *Galilee*, after he ſhould riſe from the Dead: And yet if the Evangeliſts had not after this related that he had done it, it would

would not thence have followed that *Jeſus* had never done it; nor could this have been inferred from their ſilence, with any ſound reaſon; nor would the Evangeliſts upon that Account have been unworthy of Belief: Much leſs would *Jeſus* have been ſo, unleſs the *Jew* could prove (which he can never do) that *Jeſus* did not meet his Diſciples in *Galilee*, as he promiſed he would. And he muſt, to prove that, have produced a ſtronger proof than the bare ſilence of the Evangeliſts. And yet that is more than he can pretend to. For,

2. This going of *Jeſus* into *Galilee* is mentioned. St. *Matthew* ſays expreſly, *Then the eleven Diſciples went away into* Galilee, *into a Mountain where Jeſus had appointed them; and when they ſaw him they worſhipped him*, ch. 28. 16, 17. Theſe words do not only aſſure us that the Diſciples went to *Galilee*, but alſo that they met with *Jeſus* there. St. *Matthew* did not think fit to mention all the other Appearances; but mentions this as the moſt illuſtrious. It ſeems to be that Appearance which is mentioned, 1 *Cor.* 15. v. 6. St. *John* relates alſo this Appearance in *Galilee*, ſaying, *after theſe things Jeſus ſhewed himſelf again to the Diſciples, at the Sea of* Tiberias, *ch.* 21. *v.* 1. At the *Sea of Tiberias*, that is, in *Galilee*, as we learn from

John

John 6. v. 1. We have in this Matter the expreſs Teſtimony of two Evangeliſts; and yet this bold *Jew* would inſinuate to his Reader, that *Jeſus* did not appear to his Diſciples in *Galilee*, as he had promiſed. The *Jew* believes that *Jeſus* promiſed to meet his Diſciples in *Galilee*; but why does he believe this? He ſays the Evangeliſt affirms it, and ſo it is. But why does he not believe that he did meet them there, when yet two Evangeliſts affirm that alſo? The *Jew* muſt pretend that theſe two Evangeliſts are not credible Witneſſes becauſe they do not ſpeak conſiſtently with St. *Mark* and St. *Luke*. I take that to be his meaning, and therefore I am to ſhew

3. That there is no Inconſiſtency in the Relation given by the four Evangeliſts: I will not think much to follow the *Jew*, and examine his Pretences in that order in which he hath laid them before the Reader.

And firſt I muſt begin with St. *Mark*. He relates that *Jeſus* appeared to two Diſciples; (*ch.* 16. 12.) not, as the *Jew* reports it, in *Jeruſalem*, but as they were *going into the Country*; after this he appeared to the Eleven as they ſate at Meat, *v.* 14. He diſcourſeth with his Diſciples; and ſays the *Jew*, took his laſt farewell of them,

them, and aſcended into Heaven. That is, as the *Jew* would have *Mark* ſpeak, he aſcended immediately *à Mensâ ad Cælum*, from the Table unto Heaven: And hence he raſhly concludes that *Jeſus* never appeared to his Diſciples in *Galilee*, and that he did not aſcend from Mount *Olivet* (in *Bethany*) as St. *Luke* relates, *ch.* 24. 50. and *Acts* 1. 12.

But the *Jew* makes *Mark* ſay what he never ſaid, and what is notoriouſly falſe likewiſe. What St. *Mark* ſays is this; *ſo then after the Lord had ſpoken unto them, he was received up into Heaven*, Mark 16. 19. He does not ſay that after he had ſpoken *theſe things* he was *immediately* received into Heaven, as the *Jew* would have him ſay: But that after he had given the Precepts and Promiſes which he had to impart to his Diſciples, and nothing now remained but that they ſhould be ſealed and confirmed by the *H. Ghoſt*, he was received up into Heaven. The words of St. *Mark* will be better underſtood if we compare them with the words of St. *Luke*, Acts 1. *v.* 2, 3. *Until the day in which he was taken up, after that he, through the Holy Ghoſt, had given Commandment unto the Apoſtles whom he had choſen; to whom alſo he ſhewed himſelf alive after his Paſſion, by many infallible Proofs, being ſeen of them forty*

forty Days, and ſpeaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God. So that thoſe words of St. *Mark, after the Lord had ſpoken to them*, are not to be reſtrained to the particulars mentioned, *v.* 14, 15, 16, 17, 18. but are to be underſtood of all the things delivered to them during his forty Days ſtay upon Earth. Thoſe words in St. *Mark* were ſpoken in the Evening of that Day, in which he aroſe from the Dead.

But to this purpoſe (and to put this whole Matter out of all doubt) I ſhall compare what we read in St. *John*. We find in St. *John*, ch. 20. *v.* 19. a parallel Place to *Mark* 16. v. 14. I cannot ſee the leaſt ſhadow to doubt but that it is perfectly parallel, and I believe all Mankind muſt own it. And yet St. *John* reports, that after that Appearance of *Jeſus* he appeared again to his Diſciples, after eight Days, when *Thomas* was with them, *v.* 26. And after this Appearance he relates the Appearance of *Jeſus* in *Galilee*, ch. 21. v 1. in theſe words, AFTER THESE THINGS *Jeſus ſhewed himſelf again to the Diſciples at the Sea of* Tiberias.

The *Jew* afterwards appeals to St. *Luke*, as the clearer Witneſs in this Matter. He ſays that *Luke* ſays nothing of *Galilee*, *imò totum contrarium, nempe in Jeruſalem duntaxat*

duntaxat comparuiſſe: They are the *Jews* words; he affirms that St. *Luke* affirms that *Jeſus appeared only in* Jeruſalem. He cites *Luke* 24. 50, and 52. And *Acts* 1. 12. I ſhall examine the Truth of this Aſſertion.

That St. *Luke* does not mention the Appearance in *Galilee*, is of no Moment in this Caſe, as I have ſhewed before. 'Tis enough that two Evangeliſts do mention it.

He affirms that St. *Luke* ſays, that *Jeſus* appeared only in *Jeruſalem.* But what Proof does he produce for this? The Reader might juſtly have expected a very clear one: For there is no ſuch thing ſaid in the Places which he cites from St. *Luke*, ch. 24. *v* 50, and 52, and *Acts* 1. 12. more than that St. *Luke* is ſo far from affirming any ſuch thing, that the very contrary may be collected from his words. St. *Luke* tells us that *Jeſus* led out his Diſciples as far as *Bethany*, and that upon the Aſcenſion of *Jeſus* they returned to *Jeruſalem*, from the Mount called *Olivet*, and that they looked ſtedfaſtly toward Heaven as he went up, and that this Place was from *Jeruſalem*, a Sabbath-day's Journey. This does abundantly refute the *Jew*, who pretends that St. *Luke* affirms that *Jeſus* appeared only in *Jeruſalem.*

The *Jew* affirms that St. *John* does aſſert (*ch.* 21.) *quod* Jeſus *poſtremâ vice comparuit & diſceſſit ab illis* (viz. Diſcipulis) *in Galilæa.* They are the very words of the *Jew*; but how far they are from truth, any Man will ſee that will take the pains to read over the twenty firſt Chapter of St. *John.*

For what he adds of St. *Matthew*, it needs no Anſwer, if what hath been ſaid before be duly conſidered. Upon the whole, there is nothing ſaid by the *Jew* of any Weight or Moment. I am ſorry that I can truly ſay, that he hath ſaid any thing that is notoriouſly falſe: But ſo it is, that his prejudice againſt *Jeſus* and the Evangeliſts was ſo great, that it drew him aſide, and put him upon Objections that, when examined, appear to have no truth, and conſequently no weight in them.

VII. This *Jew* proceeds to object againſt *Matth.* 26. 34: *This Night, before the Cock crow, thou ſhalt deny me thrice*; compared with other Paſſages in the Evangeliſts. In St. *Mark*, ch. 14. v. 30. it is thus, *before the Cock crow twice, thou ſhalt deny me thrice.* Whether the Cock did crow once or twice is doubtfull ſays the *Jew.* For *Matth.* ch. 26. v. 74. *Luke* ch. 22. v. 60, and *John* ch. 13. 38. and *ch.* 18. v. 27. men-

Ibid. xxxv. 1031.

tion

tion but one crowing of the Cock; but *Mark* ch. 14. v. 72. mentions the crowing of the Cock a ſecond time, as a ſignal unto *Peter*.

This may ſeem to be a conſiderable difficulty at the firſt bluſh, of theſe ſeveral ways of expreſſion: But when the Matter is throughly weighed, I hope the difficulty will vaniſh away. I anſwer,

1. That as to the difficulty occaſioned by the words in St. *Mark*, 'tis certain that there is a various Reading that removes it intirely, from *ch.* 14. v. 30. For ἢ δὶς is left out in the Ancient Copy of the Univerſity Library of *Cambridge*. Admitting the reading of that very Ancient Copy, St. *Mark* does perfectly agree with St. *Matthew*, ch. 26. 34. And then the *Jews* Objection falls of it ſelf. But I will not lay hold of this, becauſe the generality of Copies read as we do now; and I do not think it reaſonable to depart from the Reading, which the *Jew* follows, and which is moſt common.

2. I will therefore conſider the Importance of the words as they lie in St. *Matthew*, upon which the main ſtreſs of this Controverſie depends. *This Night, before the Cock crow, thou ſhalt deny me thrice*, ſays *Jeſus*; Here it is to be conſidered what is meant by thoſe words, *before the*

Cock crow. It hath been obſerved that the Cock crows twice in a Night; at Midnight, and in the fourth Watch or Approach of the Morning. The latter is more properly called the *Gallicinium*, or Cock-crowing. This is confirmed by the words of our Saviour in St. *Mark*, ch. 13. *v.* 35.---*Ye know not when the Maſter of the Houſe cometh, At Even, or at Midnight, or at the Cock-crowing, or in the Morning:* Where it is evident *that* is called the *Cock-crowing*, which does immediately precede the Morning, and which ſucceeds the Midnight. Our Saviour in *thoſe* words explains *theſe* abundantly. For though the Cock were wont to crow at Midnight, yet properly ſpeaking, that is the Cock-crowing which is the fore-runner of the Morning; this being the more noble and welcome Crowing, which precedes and uſhers in the dawning of the Day. And when the Cock-crowing is mentioned abſolutely, it is taken for this time; and is always ſo taken where there is not ſomething ſaid that does determine and limit it to another Senſe. In this caſe, I ſay, the Cock-crowing ſignifies that time when the Cock crows the ſecond time. So that thoſe words *before the Cock crow*, are as much as *ante Gallicinium*; that is, before the Cock crow twice. I am much inclined

ned to the Opinion of a very Learned Man that *Mark* took from the Mouth of *Peter* the very expreſs Words of *Chriſt*, when he ſaid, *before the Cock crow twice, thou ſhalt deny me thrice*; i. e. Before that time in which the Cock is wont to crow the ſecond time (which is, moſt properly ſpeaking, the *Cock-crowing*) thou ſhalt deny me thrice. And then St. *Mark* and St. *Matthew* perfectly agree. He that is ſo curious as to ſee this Matter more largly diſcuſſed, and proved from greater Variety of Witneſſes, may conſult *Bochartus*.

V. Bochart. ti Hieroza. ic. p. 11. l. 1. c. 17.

VIII. The *Jew* goes on and objects againſt thoſe words of *Jeſus*, John 16. 7. *I tell you the Truth, it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you: But if I depart I will ſend him unto you.* And againſt theſe words, *v.* 13. *Howbeit when he, the Spirit of Truth, is come; he will guide you into all Truth: For he ſhall not ſpeak of himſelf: But whatſoever he ſhall hear, that ſhall he ſpeak.* The *Jew* profanely and ſcoffingly ſays, that *Jeſus* affirms, that the *Spirit* (the *Third* Perſon of the *Chriſtian's Trinity*) could not come unleſs *Jeſus* returned to his Father, and ſent him. He would know why two Perſons might not

Ibid. num. 1033.

be here together; and moſt profanely and ſcoffingly offers a reaſon of his own, not fit to be named, having nothing of weight, but much of profaneneſs in it. He adds, that the *Spirit* and *Jeſus* were here together, *Matthew* 3. 16. He proceeds to ſcoff, in which I will not follow him: He ſays, if the Spirit ſpeak not of himſelf, then he hath no power of himſelf; and if he leads into all Truth, becauſe he ſpeaks not of himſelf, then ſays, if he did ſpeak of himſelf, he would not lead into all Truth.

I anſwer,

1. I obſerve, before I proceed any farther, that the *Jew* miſ-repreſents the words of *Jeſus*. He tells us that *Jeſus* does aſſert, *non poſſe*, &c. *i. e.* that the Spirit could not come unleſs he firſt returned to his Father. So that he ſuppoſeth that *Jeſus* affirmed this to be a thing abſolutely and in its own Nature impoſſible: And then exerciſes his Wit and Railery in inquiring into the Cauſes of it; and in ſo profane a Manner, that I cannot think it fit to repeat his words. He would make *Jeſus* ſay what he never ſaid, and then ſcoffs at him: But *Jeſus* does not affirm what the *Jew* ſays he did. The words of *Jeſus* are theſe. *It is expedient for you that I go away ---- If I go not away, the Comforter will*

not

not come. In which words *Jeſus* does not ſay that it was abſolutely impoſſible that he and the Spirit ſhould be upon Earth at the ſame time; and therefore the *Jew* might have ſpared his profane Scoff, in inquiring into the reaſon of this Affirmation of *Jeſus*, and his Quotation of St. *Matthew*, ch. 3. 16. *Jeſus* only affirms what was expedient for the ſorrowfull Diſciples; and that if he did not go away, the Comforter *would* not come amongſt them.

2. I ſhall next conſider the words of *Jeſus* as they lie before us in the Words of *John: I tell you the Truth, it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you: But if I depart I will ſend him unto you.* In which words our Saviour only tells his ſorrowfull Diſciples what is beſt for them, and what they might expect in the Event of things. He does not ſay that it was abſolutely impoſſible that it ſhould be otherwiſe, as the *Jew* precipitantly repreſents our Saviour's Meaning. And for the better explaining this whole Matter, I ſhall endeavour to put it into as clear a Light as I can.

Our Saviour ſpeaks to his Diſciples that were in ſorrow upon the Account of his Departure; and the more effectually to com-

fort them, lets them know that it was expedient for them that he ſhould go away: And to make them ſenſible of this, he adds, *If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you: But if I depart, I will ſend him unto you.* He foretells what will be the Event: If he ſtays, the Comforter will not come: If he go, he will ſend him. He tells them that God had in his Wiſdom thought fit that ſo it ſhould be, that the Miraculous Gifts of the *Holy Ghoſt* ſhould not be beſtowed upon the Diſciples till he ſhould be exalted to the Heavenly Kingdom. It ſeemed good to the Divine Wiſdom ſo to order things; and doubtleſs for good Cauſes. That thus it ſhould be, was predicted long before, *Pſalm* 68. 18. That place is applied to this matter by St. *Paul*, Epheſ. 4. 8. *Wherefore he ſayeth, when he aſcended up on high, he led Captivity captive, and gave Gifts unto Men.* It was God's Will that thoſe Gifts ſhould not be beſtowed till *Jeſus* was exalted to God's Right-hand. *Therefore being by the Right-hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the Promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt, he hath ſhed forth this, which ye now ſee and hear*, Acts 2. 33. This ſerves to explain what we read in *John*, ch. 7. v. 39. *The Holy Ghoſt was not yet* given, *becauſe Jeſus was*

not

not yet glorified. It was ſo ordered by God, that *Jeſus* ſhould receive the Promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt whiles he was upon Earth; but that he ſhould not beſtow the wonderfull Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt till he ſhould be exalted to God's Right-hand in his Heavenly Kingdom. And *Jeſus*, agreeably hereunto, bids his Diſciples to ſtay at *Jeruſalem*, waiting for this Promiſe of the Father.

But ſtill here was not any abſolute Neceſſity that the Spirit ſhould not be given till after *Jeſus* was glorified, as St. *Auguſtin* obſerved long ago: No doubt but *Jeſus* might have ſent him ſooner. There was no antecedent Neceſſity that things ſhould be thus: And it is evident that the *Jew* miſ-repreſents the Senſe of the Words of *Jeſus*. But though there were no antecedent Neceſſity, yet we ought to believe that what was done was beſt, and that it was becoming the Divine Wiſdom. And this Courſe was very fit, with reſpect and reference to the Holy Spirit. The mighty Miracles which were wrought by the Holy Spirit, did very much tend to the Honour of this Spirit of God, and were a great Proof of the Divinity of this Spirit of God. And this was more effectual ſtill when *Jeſus* was glorified: Whereas had theſe Miraculous Gifts been beſtowed

Auguſt. in Joan. Tract. 94.

ſtowed during his Continuance upon Earth, they might indeed have been imputed to ſome ſecret Power of *his*, but would not have been ſo publickly owned as the Works of the *Holy Ghoſt*, and as clear Proofs of the Divinity of *that Perſon* of the *Holy Trinity*. Again, it was very fit upon the Account of *Jeſus* alſo. For *Chriſt* having promiſed to ſend the Holy Ghoſt, after his departure, the Holy Ghoſt, when he came, did not only confirm the Truth of his Prediction, but alſo gave Aſſurance to his Diſciples that he was ſent by *Jeſus*, according to his Prediction; which might otherwiſe have been doubted of, if the Holy Ghoſt had been poured out whiles he lived upon Earth. The Holy Ghoſt was an *Advocate*, with reſpect to *Jeſus*; as that *word* which we render *Comforter* ſometimes ſignifies, *John* 16. v. 7, 8, *&c.* He *teſtified* of our Saviour, *John* 15. 26. And he was *juſtified by the Spirit*, 1 Tim. 3. 16. The coming of the Holy Ghoſt did not only bear witneſs to the Veracity of *Jeſus*, but was alſo an unexceptionable Proof of his Exaltation to Heaven, and of his great *Power* as well as Glory in that Place; which would not have appeared ſo evidently, had the Miraculous Gifts been beſtowed whiles *Jeſus* lived upon the Earth.

It is true, and St. *Auguſtin* takes notice of the Objection, that the Holy Spirit had been among Men before. He was in *Simeon*; by him the Virgin *Mary* conceived; *Zacharias* was filled with the Holy Ghoſt: The Holy Ghoſt attended upon the Baptiſm of *Jeſus*; and the Prophets *of old ſpake as they were moved by the Holy Ghoſt*. But the Anſwer is eaſie: Our Saviour predicts the miraculous and plentifull Effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt; which is mentioned in the *Acts*, and which came to paſs on the Day of *Pentecoſt*. We have nothing like that Effuſion mentioned before. This was promiſed and made good to the Believers. *He that believeth on me* (ſays *Jeſus*) *out of his Belly ſhall flow Rivers of living Water*. It follows, *This ſpake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him ſhould receive: For the Holy Ghoſt was not yet* given, *becauſe Jeſus was not yet glorified*, John 7. 38, 39. Whence it is very evident, that theſe words refer to the ſtupendious and plentifull Effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt on the Day of *Pentecoſt*. Prophecy had ceaſed of a long time before theſe words were ſpoken; and though ſome Holy Men had, upon occaſions, received the Holy Ghoſt, yet this plentifull Effuſion was reſerved till *Jeſus* was glorified. *Tract. 32. in S. Joan.*

It

It is farther ſaid what the Spirit ſhall do when he does come, *v.* 13. *He will guide you into all truth.* All neceſſary Truth, whether relating to Faith, or Manners, or the eſtabliſhing and well governing the Church.

For he ſhall not ſpeak of himſelf, i. e. He ſhall deliver nothing for Truth but what is the Will of God, nothing contrary to it. Compare *John* 7. 18. ch. 8. v. 26. and ch. 14. v. 10. He ſhall diſcharge the Office of a faithfull Legate; and deliver to you nothing but what he *hears*, i. e. receives, from my Father and me, who ſend him. The *Jew* might have ſpared his Scoff, when he ſays, if the Spirit ſpeak not of himſelf he hath no power of himſelf. His not ſpeaking of himſelf ſpeaks his Veracity, but does not infer want or defect of Power; for God, who is Almighty, yet cannot lye, or repent. The *Jews* laſt words are as weak and vain as any thing can be, *viz.* That if the Spirit did ſpeak of himſelf, he would not lead into all truth. If what hath been ſaid before be conſidered, it will need no Anſwer: The Spirit of God cannot be ſuppoſed to ſpeak of himſelf, in that Senſe in which that is to be underſtood, without a Contradiction.

The

The same *Jew* objects against the Evangelists Relation of *Jesus* his eating the *Passeover*. The Disciples ask *Jesus* (Matth. 26. 17.) on the *first day* of the Passeover, where he would have them prepare to eat the Passeover; and *Jesus* directed them in this matter. This first day, the *Jew* says, was that day in the Evening whereof they killed and did eat the Paschal Lamb; the following Night being the time whence the first Day of the Passeover commenced. After *Jesus* had eaten of the Paschal Lamb, he went out to pray; and that that very Night he was taken, and Crucified the next Day. This the *Jew* says cannot consist; it not being lawfull to apprehend, to accuse in Court, nor to execute a Malefactor, on that solemn Festival. He adds that *John* relates that *Jesus* supped with his Disciples, and performed all the Rites of the Passeover, and that the day before the Passeover he was Crucified, and was Buried; and to prove this, he refers to *John* 13. at the beginning, and to *John* ch. 19. *v.* 14. 31. And that *Luke* intimates the same, *ch.* 23. 54. Though he be in that matter inconsistent with himself. He says *John* is contradicted by the other Evangelists; besides that no Man could eat the Paschal Lamb out of its appointed time. IX. *Ibid. num.* 1034.

From

From the whole, he infers the Incredibility of the Relation. Here are a great many things that are with great Application of Mind to be conſidered, ſeparately, and apart: When that is done, we ſhall ſoon ſee whether there be any weight or not in what this *Jew* hath laid before his Reader. I anſwer,

1. I obſerve that the *Jew* ſpeaks inconſiſtently with himſelf. The firſt Day mentioned (*Matth.* 26. 17.) He ſays was the firſt Day of the Paſſeover, that is, ſays he, *ante ejus ingreſſum*, i.e. before the Paſſeover began, *in which the Paſchal Lamb was ſacrificed, which was done in the Evening*, viz. *before the Night, from which* (Night) *begins the firſt Day of the Paſſeover, and in which the Lamb was eaten:* All that I obſerve in this matter is this only, that the *Jew* ſpeaks either very obſcurely, or very inconſiſtently with himſelf. If his meaning be that it was the Day before the Paſſeover, then he does not ſpeak clearly, when he calls it the firſt Day of the Paſſeover. If this be not his meaning, then he ſpeaks inconſiſtently, becauſe he ſays afterwards, that the firſt Day of the Paſſeover commenced from the Evening of that Day when theſe words were ſpoken. But I lay no great ſtreſs upon this.

2. I

2. I obſerve that the *Jew*, to ſerve his purpoſe, and promote his Opinion, makes uſe of a Teſtimony, or Argument, which is nothing to his Purpoſe: And this I make appear.

Thus to prove the time of our Saviour's eating the Paſſeover, he cites the beginning of the thirteeenth Chapter of St. *John*: Here he would have his Reader believe that the Supper mentioned, *John* 13. v. 2. was the Paſchal Supper. This belief would encreaſe the Difficulties that attend upon this matter, it would ſerve his purpoſe which was to repreſent the Evangeliſts as inconſiſtent with each other, and therefore he produceth that place.

I ſhall ſhew that the Supper mentioned in that place was not the Paſchal Supper, I do very well know that many learned Men are of that Opinion, and know alſo the Conſequence of it in my preſent Debate. I ſhall therefore with all Clearneſs, that is poſſible, ſhew that it was not the Paſchal Supper which is mentioned, *John* 13. *v.* 2. And that appears, (1) From St. *John* 13. v. 1. It is there expreſly ſaid *to be before the Feaſt of the Paſſeover*. 'Tis probable that it is the ſame which is mentioned, *Matth.* 26. 6. Which was in the Houſe of *Simon* the Leper, which was two Days before the Paſſeover, *Matth.* 26. v. 2.

Mark

Mark 14. v. 1. (2) From *John* 13. v. 27, 29. *Jeſus* ſaid unto *Judas*, *That thou doeſt, do quickly.* Theſe words were not underſtood by the other Diſciples. Some of them thought, becauſe *Judas* had the Bag that the meaning of thoſe words of *Jeſus* was that he ſhould buy thoſe things, which were needfull againſt the Feaſt. That Feaſt muſt be the Feaſt of Paſſeover; had the Paſchal Supper been over, the Diſciples could never have thought that the meaning of theſe words. (3) From *Luke* ch. 22. v. 3. *Then entred Satan into Judas*; and *v.* 4. And *he went his way, and communed with the Chief Prieſts, and Captains, how he might betray him unto them.* It follows in St. *Luke* v. 7. *Then came the Day of Unleavened-bread when the Paſſeover* (i. e. the Paſchal Lamb) *muſt be killed.* So the Devil entred into *Judas* before the Paſſeover, *viz.* at the Supper mentioned, *John* 13. v. 2. with *v.* 27, and that Supper muſt therefore be before the Paſſeover, and conſequently it could not be the Paſchal Supper. (4) The Paſchal Supper was a part of the Feaſt of Paſſeover, and ſo conſiderable a part, that it gave a Denomination to the whole Feaſt, and therefore ought not to be excluded from the Title of that Feaſt, and if ſo the Supper *John* 13. v. 2. which is ſaid to be before

before the Feaſt of Paſſeover could not be the Paſchal Supper. (5) If the Supper which is mentioned, *John* 13. v. 2. were the Paſchal Supper, *Judas* muſt be ſuppoſed to have made his Agreement to betray *Jeſus* with the Prieſts, and Captains, that very Night after Supper, which is by no means to be ſuppoſed. For he had not time that Night to do it. For that Night they did not ſup together. By the Law every Maſter of a Family was obliged to ſup with his Family, and ſuch a Number of Men as *Judas* had to agree, and contract with could not be ſuppoſed to be together that Night, and yet they could not contract unleſs they were together, and did it by common Conſent. (6) From *John* 14. 31. compared with *John* 18. v. 1. It may well be concluded that *Jeſus* did change his place, when he had ſaid, *Ariſe, let us go hence*, but then that change of place after the Paſſeover, *ch.* 18. v. 1. is clearly another from that mentioned, *ch.* 14. v. 31. The Reader that is curious may ſee more upon this Argument in a very learned Writer of our own.

Lightfoot's Hor. Hebr. in Matt. 26. v. 6.

I add that there is nothing mentioned in this Chapter of a Paſchal Supper. The waſhing of the Diſciples Feet is no rite belonging to the Paſchal Supper. Mr. *Buxtorf* owns that there was no ſuch uſage a-

Inſtitut. SS. Conſ.

mong the *Jews*, though he were himſelf of opinion otherwiſe that *John* 13. v. 2. is to be underſtood of the Paſchal Supper. Let them that are of this opinion ſhew how theſe Difficulties which attend it can be anſwered: Let them ſhew what Rites of the Paſchal Feaſt they can find in this 13th Chapter of St. *John*. Here is no mention of the Inſtitution of the Lord's Supper. And the *Jew*, who to ſerve his purpoſe would have Chap. 13th of St. *John* to be underſtood of this Supper, yet frankly owns that there is no mention of the Chriſtian Euchariſt in St. *John*'s Goſpel.

J. Ab. Amram. Ibid. n. 1084.

I muſt do the *Jew* right, tho' St. *John* ch. 13. do not ſerve his purpoſe, yet the other places he quotes from *John* ch. 19. v. 14. and *v.* 31. deſerve to be very carefully conſidered. His deſign is to prove from thoſe places, that St. *John* relates, that *Jeſus* was crucified, and buried the Day before the Paſſeover. *It was the preparation of the Paſſeover*, v. 14. And after our Saviour died on the Croſs, it is ſaid, *the Jews therefore, becauſe it was the preparation, that the Bodies ſhould not remain upon the Croſs on the Sabbath-day beſought* Pilate, &c. v. 31. He ſays, that in this St. *Luke* agrees, and *that was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on*, Luke 23. 54.

If

If *Jeſus* did die a Day before the Paſſeover how could he be ſaid to have eaten the Paſſeover with his Diſciples; for that could not be eaten but in its appointed time. I anſwer therefore,

3. I will not diſpute with the *Jew* concerning the preciſe Time when *Jeſus* kept this laſt Paſſeover with his Diſciples. I will *ſuppoſe* (I do not ſay *grant*) that he kept the Paſſeover Supper with his Diſciples a Day before the *Jews* eat their Paſchal Supper; which is what the *Jew* contends for. Yet ſtill upon this Suppoſition I will defend the Evangeliſts, whom he would endeavour to repreſent as inconſiſtent with one another. And if I do that I have done the *Jew* reaſon, and he will have no cauſe to complain, or to repreſent the Holy Evangeliſts as unworthy of Belief. And there are two things to this purpoſe which I ſhall lay before the Reader.

Firſt, That there was a two-fold Paſſeover in uſe among the *Jews*. There was a πάσχα θύτικον and μνημοσυνικὸν, i.e. The Paſſeover was *ſacrificial* or *commemorative*. The firſt of theſe was *ſolemn* and *full* and perfectly agreeable to the Law of *Moſes*. This was determined and fixed as to the preciſe *Time*, and *Place* alſo, when God had made choice of *Jeruſalem* for the place of his publick Worſhip. There was the Paſ-

chal Lamb ſlain as a proper Sacrifice, and the Blood ſprinkled upon the Altar by the Prieſts at the Temple. Of this there is no diſpute between the *Jews* and *Chriſtians*. The utmoſt then that the *Jew* can contend for is, that *Jeſus* did not juſt before his Death keep this Paſſeover with his Diſciples: Nor will I contend with the *Jew* about this matter. Let it be ſuppoſed that *Jeſus* did not keep this Paſſeover. But then there was alſo a Paſſeover that was *commemorative*, which was not fixed to *Time* and *Place* as the *Sacrificial* was. This was ſubrogated or ſubſtituted into the room and place of the *Sacrificial* for the ſake of thoſe *Jews* who were diſperſed and lived at a great diſtance from *Jeruſalem*, and could not therefore be preſent at their ſolemn Feſtivals. 'Tis reaſonable to believe that theſe *Jews* whereever they were muſt think themſelves obliged to commemorate the Mercy of God in delivering their Fore-fathers from the Bondage of *Egypt*. And though they could not by their Law ſacrifice out of their Land, yet they muſt be obliged to commemorate God's Mercies. There is no doubt but that the pious *Jews* even in *Babylon* did this. And the *Jews* among us do it to this Day. And yet neither could the Devout *Jews* in *Babylon*, nor can the

Jews

Jews living among us do it any otherwiſe than by way of Commemoration. Sacrifice they cannot, I might ſay they ought not, by their own Law, but they may keep a Supper, they may eat Unleavened-bread (and they do it) and bitter Herbs. *Maimonides* gives us an Account of the Paſſeover Supper, and the Proviſions for it during the ſtanding of the Temple: But then he adds that in *this Time*, i. e. the Time of their Captivity, מביאים וכו' *they bring to the Table two ſorts of Fleſh, one a* MEMORIAL *of the Paſſeover, and the other a* MEMORIAL *of the Chagigah.* *H. Chametz U-matzah*, c. 8. S. 1.

But it will be objected that granting ſuch a Commemorative Paſſeover in *Babylon*, and in remote places, and now the Temple is down, yet was there no occaſion for it in our Saviour's Time. The Temple was then ſtanding. It is not to be ſuppoſed that *Jeſus* would depart from the Letter of the Law when it was in his Power to keep to it.

To this it is anſwered, that *Jeſus* knew that he was to die the next Day, and therefore not being to live to the Legal Time he anticipated it and muſt do ſo, or not keep the Paſſeover at all. And in that Caſe he did all that was poſſible for him to do, when he kept the *commemora-* *Grot. in Matt. 26. v. 18.*

tive Paſſeover. In which he was ſo far from breaking the Law of God, that he kept it as far as it was poſſible to do it. He did that which was allowable in all Caſes of Neceſſity. Thus *Matth.* 26. 18. *Jeſus* ſays to his Diſciples, *Go into the City to ſuch a Man, and ſay unto him the Maſter ſaith, my time is at hand I will keep the Paſſeover at thy Houſe with my Diſciples:* What we render *I will keep* is ποιῶ in the preſent Tenſe, *I keep*, that is, I cannot ſtay to the following Day when the Paſchal Lamb was to be ſacrificed, but intend forthwith (my time being at hand) to keep the Paſſeover with my Diſciples. 'Tis farther obſerved that *Jeſus* is ſaid to *eat* the Paſſeover, not to *ſacrifice* it. We grant that the *ſacrificial* Paſſeover could not be kept out of the legal and appointed Time. But this does not infer that *Jeſus* might not keep that which was the *Commemorative*.

Perhaps it may be objected that this Account of the Anticipation of this laſt Paſſeover which *Jeſus* kept is a Novel Opinion, and not of any Antiquity, and therefore not to be credited.

Photius Bibliothec. Edit. Rothomag. pag. 291 & 294.

To this it is anſwered, that ſeveral of the Ancients have ſaid the ſame. *Photius* is a competent Witneſs in this Caſe. He tells us he had read a Book of an *Anonymous* Au-

Author, written against the *Jews*, in which the Author affirms, τῇ ἁγίᾳ πέμπτῃ μὴ τὸ νομικὸν φαγεῖν πάσχα τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν χριστόν· μηδὲ γὰρ ἦν τότε τὸν καιρὸν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἐπιούσῃ, *i.e.* That, *Our Lord Jesus Christ did eat the Passeover on the fifth* Day of *the holy* Week, *which was not legal, for the time* (or legal Season) *was not then, but the following Day.* The same *Photius* mentions another of the Ancients who writ a Book concerning the Feast of Passeover, in which he affirms, Ὅτι κατὰ μὲν, &c. *That Christ our Lord and God did in the other Years of his presence keep a legal Passeover, but did not do so, in that Year when he was betrayed.* This is sufficient to shew that this is no Novel Doctrine.

Secondly, Supposing that *Jesus* did keep the *Sacrificial* Passeover, yet in that Case I have something to offer the *Jew* which will be enough to silence him, and, I hope, sufficiently defend the Evangelists.

And that is what hath been said on this occasion by a very learned Countryman of our own. He tells us that the difference of time between our Saviour's Passeover, and that of the *Jews*, must be derived from the way of reckoning the Month, and of determining the ראש החדש or, *beginning of the Month*, which was in use in our Saviour's Time, which was by the φά-

Dr *Cudworth's* Notion of the Lord's Supper.

&c. He deſcribes the whole Manner of it in the following words.

Talmud. Babylon. in Roſh Haſhan. & Maimon. Kiddoſh. Hachod.

In the great or outer Court of the Temple there was a Houſe called Bethjazek, *where the Senate ſate all the thirtieth Day of every Month, to receive the Witneſſes of the Moon's apparence, and to examine them. And here they always had a Feaſt provided for the Entertainment of thoſe that came, to encourage Men to come the more willingly. In Ancient Times they did admit of Strangers, and receive their Teſtimony, if it were approved upon Examination. But when the Hereticks (that is, the Chriſtians) afterward grew up, by whom (they ſay) they were ſometimes deluded, they began to grow ſhy, and to admit of none but ſuch as were approved of to be of the Jew's Religion. If there came approved Witneſſes upon the thirtieth Day of the* ראש חדש *ſeen, then the chief Man of the Senate ſtood up, and pronounced* MEKUDDASH, *it is ſanctified; and the People ſtanding by caught the word from him, and cried out* MEKUDDASH, MEKUDDASH. *Whereupon there was notice preſently given to all the Country which was done at firſt by Torches from Mountain to Mountain, till at length the Chriſtians (they ſay) abuſed them in that kind alſo with falſe fires; wherefore they were*

fain

fain to ſend Meſſengers from place to place over the whole Land to give intelligence of the New Moon. But if, when the Conſiſtory had ſate all the thirtieth Day, there came no approved Witneſſes of the φάσις, then they made an Intercalation of one Day in the former Month, and decreed the following one, and thirtieth Day to be the Calends. And yet notwithſtanding, if after the fourth, or fifth Day there ſhould come ſome Witneſſes from afar, that teſtified they had ſeen the φάσις in its due time; nay, though they came toward the End of the Month, the Senate, when they had uſed all means by affrighting them from that Teſtimony, that ſo, if it were poſſible, they might decline a new Conſecration, (after they had already made an Emboliſm in the former Month,) if the Witneſſes remained conſtant, were then bound to alter the beginning of the Month, and reckon it a Day ſooner, to wit, from the thirtieth Day.

We may learn hence the ground of the difference of a Day concerning the Calends, and conſequently the Feaſts depending thereupon; *viz.* from the true φάσις, and the Senate's Decree. It appears that the Senate having once decreed and made their Conſecration of the *Neomenia*, were very unwilling to make any Alteration: And

And the Senate in corrupt Times might refuſe to approve of the Teſtimony of undoubted Witneſſes in the caſe. And hence we may well ſuppoſe that the difference of time between our Saviour's Paſſeover and that of the *Jews* may be well accounted for. It was a Canon or Conſtitution among the *Jews*, that what the *Sanhedrin* or Senate had decreed in this Matter, tho' they were miſtaken in their Judgment, muſt ſtand good. Our Saviour and other pious *Jews* could not be obliged by this Canon in any good reaſon. This probably might be the caſe in our Saviour's Time, and that he followed the true φάσις and ſome Number of the ſuperſtitious *Jews* the Decree of the *Sanhedrin*, which was for the day after. So that ſuppoſing our Saviour to have kept the *Sacrificial* Paſſeover it is from what hath been ſaid eaſie to underſtand how our Saviour's Paſſeover might be ſacrificed a day before that of ſome of the other *Jews*. And then the ſeeming inconſiſtence of the Evangeliſts is removed, and I think the force of all the *Jew*'s Objections intirely taken away.

Maimon. Kiddush Hachod c. 1. S. 10.

For in ſuch a caſe we may well ſuppoſe the *Jews* divided. That *Jeſus* and many others with him kept the preciſe time according to the true φάσις or appearance,

pearance, and that another part of them ſtuck to the *Sanhedrin*'s Decree, and kept it the day after. And then it is infinitely plain that our Saviour kept it the *right* time, and the other *Jews* in the *wrong*. For notwithſtanding the Canon or Conſtitution above-named, it is certain that *Jeſus* obſerved the time that was Legal, the φάσις being the true Direction in this whole Matter. For what our very learned Author mentioned before quotes from *Epiphanius*, I ſuppoſe the Printer hath done him wrong as to the quotation. However it is certain that *Epiphanius* in another place ſays, that the *Jews* did keep their Paſſeover that Year not in the Legal time, but then he adds withal ſuch things as render that Teſtimony of no manner of force in this my Argument againſt the *Jew*: And I think I ought not to urge any thing as a proof, which upon examination will not bear. What other place may be elſewhere in that Father to my preſent purpoſe I cannot tell.

Epiphan. in Panar. Hæreſ. LI.

What I am going to add on this occaſion is Matter of greater Moment in the queſtion before us, and it is this. That the differences ariſing concerning the conſecrating of the *Neomenia*, it came to paſs in ſuch doubtfull Caſes, that the *Jews* per-

permitted the Feaſts (and particularly the Paſſeover) to be kept two days together. *Maimon* hath declared himſelf upon this occaſion. He affirms that the *Jews* who lived remote kept two days, and that in *Jeruſalem* where the Senate ſate they kept the New Moon two days. Our very learned Author produceth an inſtance out of the *Talmud* of the Paſſeovers being kept two days together, becauſe the New Moon was doubtfull. Hence the *Karraites* who are governed by the Moons φάσεις, retain as a Rule to this day (ſays our Author) *obſervare duos dies propter dubium*, i. e. *To keep two days in a doubtfull Caſe*. In imitation of whom even the *Rabbinical Jews* are obſerved to keep the Paſſeover two days together.

Kiddush Hachod c. 5. S. 6, 7.

I do not know any thing now in the *Jew*'s Objections which can have any force, if what hath been ſaid before be duly conſidered, and the *Jew* ought not to repreſent the Evangeliſts as unworthy of Credit, unleſs he can anſwer what is offered in their Defence.

X. The *Jew* would diſparage the relation of *Pilate*'s waſhing his Hands before his giving *Jeſus* up to be crucified, as importing his Unwillingneſs to put him to death

If

If he were unwilling, ſays the *Jew*, to put him to death, how came *Pilate* to ſcourge him before that? *Ibid.* num. 1036.

But this Objection is ſo frivolous that it needs no Anſwer. There is no accounting for the Actions of an unjuſt Judge. 'Tis enough that there is nothing related in this Matter, that does in any Degree weaken the Credit of the *Relators*.

XI. The *Jew* objects againſt St. *John*, for ſaying that *Nicodemus brought a mixture of Myrrh and Aloes about an hundred pound Weight*, ch. 19. 39. He affirms that this was enough for two hundred dead Bodies, and that it could not be carried with leſs than the ſtrength of a *Male*, and therefore not by *Nicodemus*. And therefore this Relation of St. *John* is not worthy of belief. I anſwer, *Ibid.* num. 1049.

1. We have nothing but this *Jew*'s word for it, that this was enough for two hundred Bodies, and that this would have been a Load for a Mule: We have no manner of reaſon to believe this. Had the *Jew* done any thing to the purpoſe, he ſhould have told us what was the Weight of the λίτρα mentioned by St. *John*, and reduced the hundred to a Weight known among us, that the Reader might have

have been able to ſee the force of the Objection. But 'tis probable this was beyond his skill, the λίτρα being a Greek word, and a Greek weight ſignified thereby, and not of Hebrew extraction. And we having no aſſurance of the Exact weight from the *Jew* are not concerned at what he ſays, that *Nicodemus* could not carry ſo great a Burden. Beſides, *Nicodemus* might be properly ſaid to bring what he cauſed to be brought.

V. Heinſii Ariſtarch.

2. We will conſider what was the Cuſtom of the *Jews* on theſe occaſions. 'Tis a thing well known that among the *Jews*, the Bodies of great Men were buried with great quantity of Spices. We read of *Aſa*, that *they buried him in his own Sepulchre, which he had made for himſelf, in the City of* David, *and laid him in the Bed, which was filled with ſweet Odors, and divers kinds* of Spices, 2 *Chr.* ch. 16. *v.* 14. It was allowed to be profuſe in this Expence. And *Nicodemus* out of Honour to our Lord may well be allowed to be at greater Expence than uſual. Beſides, we Chriſtians do believe that honourable Burial of our Saviour was predicted long before by the Prophet *Iſaiah*, and then it is not ſtrange that the fulfilling that Prediction ſhould be very remarkable.

The

The *Jew* ſubjoins, under the ſame Number, that St. *John* ſays, that *Mary* ſeeking at the Sepulchre for the Body of *Jeſus* found two Angels, to which St. *Luke* agrees: But (ſays he) *Matthæus teſtatur unum duntaxat inveniſſe*, i. e. *Matthew teſtifies that ſhe found one only.* To which, ſays he, *Mark* agrees. I anſwer,

That for the main of this Objection it hath been anſwered fully already, and I will not ſo far impoſe upon the Reader as to repeat in this place what I have ſaid before upon this occaſion. I am ſatisfied that Anſwer may ſatisfie any *Jew*, that is willing to receive reaſonable Satisfaction. *Part* II. *pag.* 117.

The reaſon why I mention it here is, that I might lay before the Reader the great inſincerity of the *Jew* in miſ-repreſenting St. *Matthew*, and St. *Mark*. He would have his Reader believe that theſe two Evangeliſts affirm that there was one only Angel found, and not two as the others affirm, and that out of a Deſign to make them contradict each other; whereas in truth St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark* affirm no ſuch thing as the *Jew* pretends, as the Reader, who can believe his Eyes, may ſoon find. I muſt needs ſay that this is very unjuſt, and at this rate he may eaſily impoſe upon the unwary Reader.

The

XII. The *Jew* objects againſt the words of *Jeſus*, Matth. 28. 18. where he ſays to his Diſciples, *All power is given to me in Heaven and in Earth.* If *Jeſus* were God, equal with the Father how could he ſay this: Theſe words ſuppoſe he had it not before. Perhaps ſays he, he receiv'd it for the Merit of the Croſs, or that the Father being weary with long governing now leaves that Care to his Son, as he ſcoffingly proceeds. I anſwer,

Ibid. num. 1041.

1. That we Chriſtians do believe the Son to be God, and Co-eternal with the Father, and therefore he had power before this power ſaid to be given him in theſe words.

2. What we Chriſtians teach is this: That the Son of God, the λόγος is a Divine Perſon, and as ſuch he hath a natural and independent Authority and Right over all his Creatures, whether in Heaven or on Earth, as he is the Creator of them: The words in St. *Matthew* are not to be underſtood of this Right or Authority; for this is independent and underived. But the Power mentioned in St. *Matthew* is to be underſtood of a Right imparted to him as a Man that was ſent by God, anointed, and conſtituted the Mediator between God and Man, and

was

was raiſed from the Dead, and exalted into Heaven. Now this derived Authority is partly *Oeconomical*, and therefore to be reſigned to the Father from whom it was derived, aſſoon as thoſe Ends are fully accompliſhed for which this Power was at firſt granted; partly ſo *proper* to the *union*, or *due* to the Paſſion of the Humane Nature, that it muſt be coeval to it, that is, of Eternal duration. To confirm all this from the New Teſtament will ſignifie nothing to a *Jew*, but however this is enough to ſet the Matter in its true Light. And for the profane Scoffs of the *Jew* I leave him to a Righteous Judge, it does not become me to render him Scoff for Scoff. I do not think that Method could ever gain any Proſelytes. But if the *Jew* will pretend to reply, he ought to take this queſtion as it is ſtated by Chriſtians, and to anſwer it as it is ſo ſtated, and then he may expect farther ſatisfaction.

XIII. The *Jew* objects againſt *John* 21. 25. and prefaces to his Objection. He ſays, he hath often obſerved and proved that the Goſpels are of ſuſpected Credit, he adds, and of no Credit: And among them that of *John* eſpecially, becauſe he ſays, *and there are alſo many other things*

Ibid num. 1094.

which Jeſus did, the which if they ſhould be written every one, I ſuppoſe that even the World it ſelf would not contain the Books that ſhould be written. Here the *Jew* objects that St. *John*'s Phraſe is not Scriptural, that *Jeſus* did not preach till he was thirty Years of Age, that then he did not continue above three Years, more or leſs, till his Crucifixion. How many Books (ſays he) could be written? A Book for a Day? But would not the World contain ſo many? Why did *John* write ſo little a Goſpel? And that he ſays was replete with vain, and amorous, and rhetorical Speeches, beginning from *ch.* 14. *v.* 7. Some more ſuch Stuff he adds not worth the repeating; having nothing in them of reaſon, or force.

I anſwer,

1. That I do not doubt of his ill Opinion of the Evangeliſts. I dare take a *Jew*'s word for that: But that he hath proved them to be of ſuſpected, and of no Credit, I cannot take his word for that. And yet I am never like to have any better Proof than the word of the *Jew*.

2. However, I am no farther concerned in this place than to defend St *John* for the words afore-recited: I believe I ſhall not find any great Difficulty in that Matter.

ter. Nor will I lay hold of any Evaſion: I will not ſuppoſe that the world's not containing is to be interpreted of the Incapacity of the Men of the World. This looks too much like Artifice.

3. I do allow it to be an Hyperbolical Expreſſion. But of all Men in the World a *Jew* ſhould not have brought this Objection againſt the Evangeliſts, becauſe not only the Sacred Writers of the Old Teſtament take this liberty which St. *John* takes, but the Jewiſh Writers do it frequently, and nothing is more common in other Writers, and common Diſcourſe and Converſation.

For the Sacred Writers nothing is more common. St. *Auſtin* long ſince takes notice of that Hyperbolical Expreſſion, *Gen.* 13. *v.* 16. where God ſays to *Abram: I will make thy Seed as the Duſt of the Earth, ſo that if a Man can number the Duſt of the Earth,* then *ſhall thy Seed alſo be numbred.* What proportion was there between the Seed of *Abram* (I might have ſaid *Adam*) and the Duſt of the Earth? As great the Diſproportion is as between the ſpace that thoſe Books would take up, which might have been written of *Jeſus*, and the Capacity of the whole World. And theſe are the words of God himſelf: And I hope the *Jew* will not be ſo profane

Aug. de Civ. D. l. 16. c. 21.

as to ſcoff at them, whatever he does by the Evangeliſt. Compare *Gen.* 15. v. 5. God promiſeth to the *Iſraelites* a Land flowing with Milk and Honey, *Exod.* 3. 8. The Expreſſion is Hyperbolical, but all that is meant is a very fruitfull Land. Thus we read of a Darkneſs that may be felt, for a great Darkneſs, *Exod.* 10. 21. Of a great Number of Camels Hyperbolically expreſſed, by being *without Number, as the Sand of the Sea ſide for Multitude*, Judges *ch.* 7. v. 12. Compare 1 *Sam.* 13. 5. Thus when there was a great Noiſe of Pipes, it is Hyperbolically expreſſed thus, that *the Earth rent with the ſound of them*, 1 Kings 1. 40. The Wealth of *Solomon*'s time is thus Hyperbolically expreſſed. *The King made Silver* to be *in Jeruſalem as Stones, and Cedars made he* to be *as the Sycomore trees that are in the Vale through abundance*, 1 Kings 10. 27. The Reader may find more of theſe ways of ſpeaking, *Gen.* 10. 4. *Numb.* 13. 33. *Dan.* 4. 20. And in this very Evangeliſt, *ch.* 12. 19. So that the Evangeliſt's way of ſpeaking may be juſtified from the Sacred Writers, whatever the *Jew* affirms to the contrary..

P. Martyr Loc. Com. P. II. c. 47.

But all Men know, that are converſant in the Jewiſh Writings, that they are full of ſuch kind of Expreſſions:

as

as the Sacred Writers are confessed so to be, so are the *Talmudical* and other Writers, which yet are of great Fame, and Esteem among them. There are some things said by the Jewish Doctors so very strange and surprizing, that this Hyperbolical Speech of St. *John* can give no just Offence to a *Jew* of any Men whatsoever. For their way of speaking is so Romantick, that if we consider the bare Letter, they cannot be defended. We must allow them their דרך נזומא, *i. e.* their Hyperbolical way of speaking, or we must suppose that there lies a farther and more hidden meaning under the Letter, than what the bare Letter imports. It is a saying among the *Jews*, that *God hath nothing in this his World but four Cubits of Talmudical Constitutions. Maimonides* takes a great deal of Pains to defend this odd Expression. Many more such Expressions we have which cannot be defended without allowing of great *Hyperboles*, or of some other Meaning than the bare Letter will afford, of which 'twere easie to give several Instances, if it were worth the Reader's while.

V. Dr Pocock's Port. Mosis, p. 90.

V. Hackspan in Lipman Nizachon, c. 2.

Again there is nothing more common than *Hyperboles* in all other Writers, and common Conversation. The *Jew* if he

pleaſe may quarrel with all Mankind as well as with St. *John* on this Account.

4. For his Scurrility and Scoffs they prove nothing but the rancor and vanity of his own Mind. Thoſe Divine Words in St. *John* 14. and the following Chapters are far above Contempt. But there is nothing ſo Sacred which a profane and reprobate Mind will not reproach and revile.

XIV. The ſame *Jew* objects againſt St. *Paul* for his words, *Gal.* 3. v. 10. *For as many as are of the Works of the Law are under the Curſe: For it is written, Curſed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the Book of the Law to do them.* He thinks St. *Paul* very unequal in this Matter: For 'tis certain according to the Doctrine of the Old Teſtament, he was pronounced curſed that obeyed not; on the other Hand he was eſteemed Bleſſed, who yielded Obedience to the Law of *Moſes*. The *Jew* demands of St. *Paul* what Puniſhment he ſhall incur, who profeſſeth and does not practice the Chriſtian Religion? He ſuppoſeth he will anſwer that he will incur Hereſie or Eternal Condemnation: Then (ſays the *Jew*) may I infer, that whoſo is under the Chri-

Ibid. num. 1097.

Chriſtian Faith or Religion, is under Hereſie or Eternal Condemnation, by the ſame reaſoning that St. *Paul* uſeth here. He ſays that *Paul* runs into the ſame Impiety again, *Rom.* 4.20. & *ch.* 4.15. & *ch.* 5. v.13. where he affirms that we cannot be juſtified by the Works of the Law, becauſe by it we come to the Knowledge of Sin, and incur the Penalty of our Diſobedience. The *Jew* replies that Sin and Puniſhment flow from the Violation of the Law, and the keeping it would aſſure Men of the Reward. He goes on and asks the Chriſtian; He that is a Chriſtian and does not obey the Chriſtian Laws, and Papal Conſtitutions, does he ſin and incur any Penalty? He will own that he ſins and is liable to Puniſhment. Then, ſays he, I argue thus, By the Works of Faith no Man can be ſaved, for by Faith, that is the Chriſtian Doctrine, we have the Knowledge of Sin, and by our Diſobedience we render our ſelves liable to Puniſhment. According to this way of arguing (ſays the *Jew*) it would be better for Mankind to be without any Law at all. I anſwer,

1. That it is a very eaſie thing to ridicule and miſ-repreſent any Author whatſoever, if we take ſome of his words ſeparately from the Context, and frame

Objections againſt them. At this rate I could very eaſily object againſt many Paſſages of the Old Teſtament. It is fit we ſhould conſider the Argument the Author inſiſts upon, and fairly conſider the Import of the words themſelves. I do confeſs as the *Jew* lays his Objection it looks very plauſibly; but when we conſider the words with Application, and the Argument that St. *Paul* purſues, and the Context alſo, perhaps there is hardly any thing bears harder upon the *Jews* than the words of St. *Paul* do. It is infinitely plain, that St. *Paul* argues againſt thoſe who expected to be juſtified by the Law of *Moſes*; this is what he means, as is evident from the Context. Thoſe that are *of the Works of the Law*, are thoſe who expected to be juſtified by their Obedience to the Law of *Moſes*. This is ſo plainly the meaning of the Apoſtle, that I ſhall not need to prove it. Let any Man read the whole Context, and he will ſoon be ſatisfied in this Matter. This being granted (as it cannot reaſonably be denied) it will be no hard Matter to defend the Apoſtle againſt the *Jew*.

2. This being premiſed it will be very eaſie to defend St. *Paul*, both as to what he affirms here, and what he ſays upon the ſame Argument in his Epiſtle to the

Ro-

Romans. His deſign is to prove that the *Jews* had no ſufficient ground to expect to be juſtified by Obedience to the Law of *Moſes*; and conſequently to oblige them to ſeek for Juſtification by the Goſpel, which requires a Faith in our Lord *Jeſus* Chriſt. This was a main and fundamental Point between the *Jew* and Chriſtian. I ſhall conſider the ſeveral Arguments which are, and may juſtly be produced to confirm St. *Paul*'s Doctrine.

(1.) He that would be juſtified by the Law of *Moſes*, muſt give an abſolute and perfect Obedience to it. To do this the *Jew* could not pretend, and was conſequently liable for his Diſobedience to the Curſe of the Law. *Did not* Moſes *give you the Law*, ſays *Jeſus* to the *Jews*, *and yet none of you keepeth the Law?* John 7. *v.* 19. St. *Peter* calls it a *Yoke*, that neither they nor their Fathers were able to bear, *Acts* 15. 10. St. *Paul* ſhews it is not poſſible to be juſtified by this Law; he ſays it is evident from what is ſaid by the Prophet, the *Juſt ſhall live by his Faith*, Gal. 3. 11. The Condition of the Law is not that of Faith but abſolute Obedience. *The Man that doeth them ſhall live in them*, v. 12. The *Jew* cannot pretend to perfect and ſinleſs Obedience; and therefore muſt conſent to what St. *Paul* ſays elſewhere,

All

All have ſinned and come ſhort of the Glory of God, Rom. 3. 23. And conſequently the *Jew* is liable to the Curſe mentioned, *Deut.* 27. v. 26. *Curſed is he that confirmeth not* all *the words of this Law to do them.* The *Jew* can never with good ground expect to be juſtified by that Law which he hath not obeyed. For if he have not obeyed its Precepts, he muſt lie under its Curſe. In this Caſe *the Law worketh Wrath*, Rom. 4. 15. The *Jew* may flatter himſelf as he pleaſeth: But he can never expect to be juſtified by that which condemns him. The words of the Law are very plain and poſitive, truly quoted and rightly applied by St. *Paul*. The Law it ſelf is our School-Maſter to bring us unto Chriſt. It excludes all the Tranſgreſſors of it from all Poſſibility of Hope of being juſtified by it: For nothing ſhort of abſolute Obedience can have any juſt Claim to be juſtified by it.

(2.) The Law of *Moſes* did not enable the *Jews* to obey its Precepts, and therefore they may not expect to be Juſtified by it. Had it given *Power* as it gave *Precepts* the *Jew* might have ſome ground to expect Juſtification this way. *By the Law is the Knowledge of Sin*, Rom. 3. 20. But not the Ability of abſolute Obedience. And therefore it condemns but juſtifies not.

not. Hence it is that St. *Paul* with great reaſon calls the Law the *Miniſtration of Condemnation*, and the *Miniſtration of Death*, 2 Cor. 3. 7, 9. And the *Letter* that *killeth* (v.6.) On the other hand he calls the Goſpel the *Miniſtration of the Spirit*, and the *Miniſtration* of *Righteouſneſs*: As we are enabled by it, and juſtified by it alſo. To the ſame purpoſe he diſcourſeth, *Rom.* 7. 5, 6. and *ch.* 8. v. 1, 2, 3. To this purpoſe it is ſaid the *Law came by* Moſes, *but Grace and Truth by* Jeſus Chriſt, *John* 1. 17. The Goſpel is called Grace with reſpect to that Grace or Heavenly Aſſiſtance with which it is attended. For it is very certain from the Old Teſtament (as I have had occaſion formerly to obſerve) that a plentiful Effuſion of the Holy Spirit was promiſed in the Days of the *Meſſias*, and we Chriſtians do believe this Promiſe was made good upon the Day of Pentecoſt. 'Twas by the Power of this Holy Spirit that the Goſpel ſpread, and that the firſt Planters of it were enabled to do and ſuffer ſo great things. And though the *Jews* deny *Jeſus* to be the Chriſt, yet the wonderfull Propagation of the Doctrine, and Faith of *Jeſus*, they cannot with any ſhadow of reaſon deny. Admitting the Matters of Fact, 'twill be next to impoſ-

ſible

ſible to impute them to any other Cauſe, but to the Power and Energy of the Holy Spirit, bearing witneſs to the Truth.

(3) Nor did the expiatory or propitiatory Sacrifices which were allowed under the Law of *Moſes*, give any juſt Aſſurance of the *Jews* being juſtified by the Law. For beſides that, theſe Sacrifices were allowed only in Caſe of Tranſgreſſion of ſome Laws, and ſo were not the primary Laws of *Moſes*, as thoſe Commands were which required Obedience to the other Laws of God: Beſides this, I ſay, theſe Sacrifices only ſheltered the *Jews* from Temporal Puniſhments, did neither reſcue them from Death, nor give them any juſt Claim to Eternal Life. To which I may add that there were a great many Sins, that by the Law of *Moſes*, would not admit of any Atonement from theſe Sacrifices, and in all thoſe Caſes the *Jew* was left without any hope of pardon by the Law of *Moſes*, ſo far was he from being juſtified by it. The *Jew* will find poor relief from this Allowance of propitiatory Sacrifices. I ſhall conſider this Matter a little more particularly, that if it be poſſible, I may convince the *Jew* in this preſence. [1.] It is to be conſidered what place the Laws about propitiatory Sacrifices have in the

Laws

Laws of *Moſes*. They do not ſtand in the firſt Place or Rank of Precepts. God required Obedience to his Laws antecedently to Sacrifices. This was God's firſt Intention, and not expiatory Sacrifices; they were required *conſequenter*, as a remedy when the Sin was committed: Sacrifice like Repentance was but *ſecunda tabula poſt naufragium*. It was the Method which God allowed for reconciling Sinners. But God required Men to obey his Laws, and not to need Expiation and Atonement. The Jewiſh Doctors teach this leſſon themſelves. *Withdraw thy foot from thy Neighbour's Houſe, leſt he be weary of thee, and ſo hate thee*, Prov. 25. 17. There is a *Midraſh* among the *Jews* that interprets thoſe words to my preſent Purpoſe: It is ſaid that by the Neighbour's Houſe is meant the Sanctuary, and it is an Admonition to Men to obey God's Laws, and not to be frequent at the Sanctuary with expiatory Sacrifices, which are not welcome to God as Obedience is. To the ſame purpoſe *Maimonides* delivers himſelf. He affirms that the Scripture and *Kabbala* do both teach that the Laws about Sacrifices are not the firſt Laws; but proceed from a ſecond Intention. It was moſt pleaſing to God that Men ſhould not tranſgreſs. God required Obedience

V. Bechai in Legem, fol. 135. c. 2. More Nevo. p. 3. c. 32. Abravanel. Præfat. in Levit. c. 4. Men. Ben Iſrael. Conciliat. p. 181.

in

in the firſt place: Upon failure he admitted in the ſecond place of an expiatory Sacrifice. *To obey is better than Sacrifice, and to hearken than the Fat of Rams*, 1 Sam. 15.22. Agreeable hereunto are the words of *Jeremy*, ch. 7. v. 22, 23. *I ſpake not unto your Fathers, nor commanded them in the Day that I brought them out of the Land of Egypt concerning Burnt-offerings or Sacrifices: But this thing commanded I them ſaying, obey my Voice.* To this purpoſe it is farther to be conſidered that the Laws concerning Sacrifices were not given till after the Decalogue, and the Statutes which were given afterwards. [2.] The Sacrifices themſelves were very defective, and did not produce the more deſirable Effects. They kept off Temporal Puniſhment, they were means to preſerve Men in the Peace and External Communion of the Church, they did not purifie the Conſcience of the Offerer, *Heb.* 9. 9, 10, 13. [3.] There were many Sins for which no Sacrifices were allowed by the Law of *Moſes*, and in this Caſe the *Jew* was left without hope of pardon from the Law of *Moſes*, and therefore could not be juſtified by it. Of this Matter I have ſpoken in another place, and therefore will not purſue it here.

Part I. *p.* 27, 28.

(4.) The

(4) The Law of *Moſes* had not any explicit Promiſe of Eternal Life, to encourage to a perfect Obedience to its Precepts. This was reſerved for the Goſpel, where it is brought to light. And now if theſe things be laid together, we ſhall find St. *Paul* fully defended againſt the *Jew*.

3. And now it will be eaſie to anſwer the *Jew*'s queſtion, what ſhall become of the Chriſtian Profeſſor who does not obey his Religion? We do not excuſe the Diſobedience of the Chriſtian, or think him exempt from Puniſhment, unleſs he repent and return to his Duty. But we do not believe our Condition to be the ſame with that of the *Jews*. The Law required of them an abſolute and perfect Obedience, which becauſe they could not yield, they could never be juſtified by that Law: For the broken Law could never juſtifie them. Our Caſe under the Covenant of Grace is otherwiſe; for our Juſtification does not depend upon an abſolute and ſinleſs Obedience, but upon a ſincere and unfeigned one. We have Divine Aſſiſtances, and a mighty Reward in our Eye. And *if any Man ſin we have an Advocate with the Father, Jeſus Chriſt the Righteous: And he is the Propitiation for our Sins*, 1 John 2. 1, 2. Let the *Jew* ſhew

ſhew what ſhadow of hope he can have of being juſtified by the Law of *Moſes*. *If we ſay we have no ſin we deceive our ſelves*——*If we confeſs our ſins, he is faithfull and juſt to forgive us our ſins, and to cleanſe us from all unrighteouſneſs*, 1 John 1. 8, 9.

XV. The ſame *Jew* proceeds to object againſt *Heb.* 9. 19. where it's ſaid that, *when* Moſes *had ſpoken every Precept to all the People according to the Law, he took the Blood of Calves and of Goats, with Water and Scarlet, Wool and Hyſſop, and ſprinkled both the Book and all the People.* The *Jew* takes theſe words to refer to *Exod.* 24. v. 7, 8. And that the Author of this Epiſtle refers to this place: But, ſays the *Jew*, he does it ſo perverſly and ſottiſhly, that one may ſecurely conclude that he was not an Hebrew, but a ſilly Wretch; for the Text in *Exodus* is thus: *And he took the Book of the Covenant, and read in the Audience of the People: And they ſaid, all that the Lord hath ſaid will we do and be obedient. And* Moſes *took the Blood and ſprinkled it on the People, and ſaid, behold the Blood of the Covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all theſe words.* Here's nothing of the Water, of the Wool, of the Hyſſop. He adds

adds that what is ſaid of ſprinkling the Blood upon the Book is falſe and fooliſh: For (ſays the *Jew*) thoſe words, *concerning all theſe words*, do only denote the Cauſe of the Covenant for which the Blood was ſprinkled upon the People, that is for the cleanſing of the People. For (ſays the *Jew*) neither did the ſprinkled Blood fall upon the People, but upon the Altar for the cleanſing of the People, as the manner was, and as the Divine *Chaldee* Paraphraſe hath it. For (ſays he) it was not poſſible, nor credible, that the Blood ſhould be ſprinkled upon all that very numerous People. Beſides (he ſays) that from *Exod.* 24. *v.* 5. there is no mention of any Blood but that of Oxen (*Taurorum* ſays the *Jew*) no mention of the Blood of Calves and Goats. And he concludes hence, that if the *Chriſtian* Cenſor would conſider the Writings of *Paul*, which are commonly owned to be his, with Attention, and with Freedom, he will find them partly vain, and partly falſe, as to the Fundamentals of the *Chriſtian* Faith.

I have faithfully repreſented the *Jew*'s Objection in its fulleſt force and ſtrength. I anſwer,

1. That I will allow that the Author of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* does refer

to *Exod.* 24. Nor will I in the leaſt controvert or diſpute this Matter with him, but take it for granted.

2. That it is very unreaſonable that the *Jew* ſhould quarrel with St. *Paul*, when he ſays the very ſame thing which *Moſes* doth ſay, whoſe Relation he follows. He ſays that *Moſes* ſprinkled the People, and *Moſes* tells us the very ſame. But the bold *Jew* ſays none of the ſprinkled Blood fell on the People, and whatever *Moſes* ſays, he will follow *Onkelos:* And pretends it was not poſſible that ſo very numerous a People ſhould be ſprinkled. And yet he does not object againſt what is ſaid before, that *Moſes read in the Audience of the People.* Sure it was as hard to do that as to ſprinkle them. I need not concern my ſelf in ſhewing how this might be done, or how it is to be underſtood. All that I obſerve at preſent is, that the *Jew* finds fault with St. *Paul* without Cauſe, when he ſays what *Moſes* ſaid before him. Indeed *Moſes* ſays he ſprinkled the People, St. *Paul* that he ſprinkled *all* the *People.* This is mere trifling. For if the People's repreſentatives were ſprinkled, all the People might be ſaid to be ſo. 'Tis not to be imagined that *Moſes*, as oft as he ſpake to the People, could be heard by all the People. If the *Jew*'s Interpretation

tation were admitted which he borrows from *Onkelos*, yet by the People, even in that Caſe, muſt be ſignified all the People, becauſe all the People ſtood in need of cleanſing: This *Jew* was ſurely greatly prejudiced againſt St. *Paul*, when he does not only quarrel with him when he departs from *Moſes*, but even when he follows him too.

3. But, ſays the *Jew*, there is no mention of the Water and the Wool, and the Hyſſop, in the words of *Moſes*, to which theſe words in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* do refer. I grant it, but it does not thence follow that no ſuch things were uſed; unleſs we do affirm that every Circumſtance was written by *Moſes* (which no Man can with any ſound reaſon believe) in thoſe things which he relates that he did. Theſe things are not mentioned here. 'Tis true: But then all theſe things are elſewhere, upon the occaſion of ſprinkling or aſperſion, which is the caſe before us. See *Levit.* 14. v. 49, 50, *&c.* *Exod.* 12. 22. *Pſ.* 51.

4. But (ſays the *Jew*) *Moſes* is ſaid to have ſprinkled the Book, which he adds is both *falſe* and *fooliſh*. If it be allowed him that this be ſaid of *Moſes*, by the Author of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, yet we have nothing but the *Jew*'s word for

it that it is falſe and fooliſh. I ſhould be very loth to take this upon his bare word, and I am ſure he offers no Argument to prove it ſo. Had he proved it fooliſh, I ſhould have believed it to be falſe without any more to do. But let us examin this Matter a little more narrowly. I own that *Chriſtians* commonly underſtand the words in the *Hebrews* as the *Jew* does. But notwithſtanding all that, I believe it cannot be proved that St. *Paul* does affirm that *Moſes* ſprinkled the Book. The beſt way to know this is to conſider his words as they lie in the Greek. Λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα τῶν μόσχων καὶ τράγων μετὰ ὕδατος καὶ ἐρίου κοκκίνου, καὶ ὑσσώπου αὐτό τε τὸ βιβλίον, καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν ἐράντισεν. These words may be tranſlated thus, *Taking the Blood of Calves and Goats with Water and Scarlet Wool and Hyſſop, and the Book, he ſprinkled all the People.* The αὐτὸ τε τὸ βιβλίον will then refer to λαβὼν, as well it may. And this perfectly agrees with *Exod* 24. 7. where it is ſaid that *Moſes* TOOK THE BOOK λαβὼν τὸ βιβλίον. And then it is as if he had ſaid ἔλαβε καὶ ἐράντισεν, &c. He took theſe things and ſprinkled the People. In this caſe the καὶ before πάντα is redundant as both καὶ in the New Teſtament, and ו in the Old Teſtament very often is, as is well

well known to all that are skilled, and well verſed in theſe Matters. I cannot imagin how the *Jew* can anſwer this Account of the words: Here is nothing ſtrained, nothing added, no Manner of Violence nor of Artifice uſed. So that if he were able to prove that it was *falſe* and fooliſh to affirm that *Moſes* ſprinkled the Book, yet it is abſolutely impoſſible for him to prove from theſe words, that St. *Paul* ever affirmed it. The *V.* Latin renders the words thus. *Accipiens ſanguinem vitulorum & hircorum, cum aqua, & lana Coccinea, & Hyſſopo, ipſum quoque Librum, & omnem Populum aſperſit.* Where *Librum* may very well refer to the *Accipiens*, and that which appears as a *Copula*, be no more but an *Expletive*, as it is very frequently in other Places.

5. But ſtill he urgeth that *Paul* mentions the Blood of *Calves* and *Goats*, whereas *Moſes* only mentions the Blood of Bulls. And this he reckons as another great fault in this Author of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*. The *Jew* is right ſo far that *Moſes* does not, as this Author does, mention the Blood of *Calves* and *Goats*, but it is by no means truly inferred from hence that *Moſes* did not uſe them. *Moſes* mentions only *Holocauſts* and *Peace-offerings*, v. 5. Had St. *Paul* not mentioned any

thing more, yet it had been reaſonable to believe, that upon this ſolemn Occaſion there was ſome Sacrifice for Sin added, to which purpoſe the Goat was of Eminent Uſe, *Levit.* 4. 23, 24. ch 9. 3. ch. 16. 15. It was the manner on ſuch Occaſions to join Sin-offerings with Peace-offerings, *v. Levit.* 9. v. 3, 4. And eſpecially where the People were to be cleanſed, for whoſe ſake the Oblation was made. Nothing can be more credible than this is to him that conſiders the whole Oeconomy and Syſtem of Sacrifices, and the Practice among the *Jewiſh* People, *v. Levit.* c. 8. & ch. 9. & ch. 14. v. 7. & v. 52. There was nothing more conſiſtent with the Ancient Uſage, and Order, than what St. *Paul* affirms here. 'Tis certain he could ſerve no End of his own by miſ-repreſenting *Moſes* in this Matter. This would have been the way to have diſſerved himſelf. Indeed the *Jew* repreſents him as ſilly and unskilfull. But that is eaſily ſaid. The Author of that Epiſtle does not argue like ſuch a Perſon.

But ſtill, though I think I have ſaid enough to ſatisfie an indifferent Perſon, yet to convince a *Jew*, I ſhall add ſomething more to what hath been ſaid already.

6. That however the *Jew* is pleaſed to diſparage our Author, yet he cannot charge

charge him with ſo much as miſ-quoting or altering the Text of *Moſes*: He tells what *Moſes* did, but he does not ſay thus it is written in the Book, or Law of *Moſes*; nor does he ſay any thing like it. He might have what he adds concerning the Wool and Water by Tradition or Inſpiration. Many Facts were conveighed down among the *Jews* by a conſtant Tradition, which were never written in the Law or Prophets. What the Apoſtle ſays of *Jannes* and *Jambres* reſiſting *Moſes*, is no where written in his Law, but yet was a Tradition among the *Jews* it ſeems, and the *Chaldee* Paraphraſt upon *Moſes*'s Law mentions thoſe Names. The Widow which is mentioned 2 *Kings* 4. 1. is by the *Chaldee* Paraphraſt ſaid expreſly to be the Widow of *Obadiah*: But then that is more than the Text ſays. Yet I think no Man can doubt, but ſo it was. *Joſephus* ſays the very ſame, the Character of the Man agrees, and ſo does the time alſo; and no *Chriſtian* (I believe) doubts but ſo it was in Fact, but yet was not ſo written in any Text of the Holy Scripture. Our Author quotes what *Moſes* did not write: Does it thence follow that he affirms what is not true? He cites not any writing upon this occaſion. He relates not what *Moſes* wrote, but what he did.

Joſeph Ant. l. 9. c. 2.

I obſerve that when he mentions the *Chaldee* Paraphraſt he calls him Divine, and he admires his Expoſition of thoſe words, *he ſprinkled the People*, when yet *Paul* in that Matter follows the Letter of *Moſes*, and the *Targumiſt* is ſuppoſed to deſtroy it. This ſpeaks the *Jew*'s prejudice againſt the *Chriſtian* Writer. It were eaſie to ſhew a Multitude of Inſtances where the *Chaldee* Paraphraſts add to the Text, and yet they muſt be Divine, and magnified, and St. *Paul* who does no ſuch thing be repreſented as ſilly or ſomething worſe. For 'tis plain that St. *Paul* does not ſo much as quote any place of Scripture upon this occaſion.

But becauſe the *Jew* does ſo much revile St. *Paul* on this occaſion, and magnifie the *Chaldee* Paraphraſt, I ſhall not think much (to ſhew how partial the *Jew* is) to reflect a little upon the *Chaldee* Paraphraſts, and ſhew what liberty they have taken of adding to the *Hebrew* Text upon occaſion. I might produce a Multitude of Inſtances. I ſhall ſelect enough for my preſent Purpoſe.

I will begin with *Onkelos*, who is the oldeſt and beſt of them, and that keeps cloſeſt to the Text. His Paraphraſe is generally rather a ſtrict Verſion, than a Paraphraſe. *Ou* Levit. 18. v. 5. to thoſe words

words *ſhall live*, he adds, *Eternal Life:* And yet is there no mention of Eternal Life in the Law of *Moſes*. Numb. 12. 1. to thoſe words *whom he had married*, or *taken*, as it is in the Marginal reading; he adds, *he diſmiſſed* her whom *he had taken*. Numb. 24. v. 1. *the Wilderneſs*; he adds, *toward the Calf which the* Iſraelites *made* in the Wilderneſs. *Numb.* 27. 18. *Spirit*; he adds *of Prophecy*. Deut. *ch.* 17. *v.* 8. he adds to *ſtroke*, *of Leproſie*. Deut. 25. 7. *To the gate*; he adds בית דינא, *i.e. of the Houſe of Judgment*. Deut. *ch.* 33. v. 6. *live*; to this he adds, *Eternal Life*. V. 18. *in thy going out*; he adds, *to fight againſt thy Enemies*. I might mention ſeveral more Additions of *Onkelos*.

For the *Jeruſalem Targum* and that of *Jonathan* on the Pentateuch, they are full of Additions. It would be too tedious and operoſe a thing to reckon them up, and therefore I will not attempt it. I ſhall name ſome few. To *Gen.* 5. v. 24. *Jonathan* adds, and *his Name was called Metatron a great Scribe*. To *Gen.* ch. 14. v. 18. *Melchizedeck King of Salem*, *Jonathan* and the *Jeruſalem* add, *he is Shem the Son of Noah*, Gen. 16. 1. To *Hagar*, *Jonathan* adds, *the Daughter of Pharaoh*, &c. He that is curious may ſee more in this Book of *Geneſis*. See thoſe *Targums* on *Geneſis*,

Chap. 24.

Chap. 24. v. 31, 55. ch. 25. v. 1, 25, 34. ch. 33. v. 4. ch. 36. v. 12. ch. 42. v. 23. ch. 43. v. 16. ch. 46. v. 13, 14. ch. 47. v. 2. He may alſo ſee them on *Exodus*, Chap. 2. v. 12. ch. 4. v. 25. ch. 6. v. 16. ch. 9. v. 20. ch. 12. v. 3, 10, 11, 29, 40, 44. ch. 15. v. 25. ch. 24. v. 5. I will not purſue theſe *Targumiſts* any farther.

For the other *Targums* I ſhould be endleſs, if I ſhould lay before the Reader the Liberties which they take. It were eaſie to give a vaſt Number of Inſtances were there any occaſion. I do readily grant that ſome of their Additions, though not warranted by the Text, might be agreeable enough to the truth of things, and to the conſtant Tradition among the *Jews*, and they may be allowed to be good and uſefull Authors notwithſtanding all theſe Additions. But then, why may not St. *Paul* be allowed to be of Credit? When what he affirms is leſs exceptionable than many Paſſages which I could eaſily produce out of the *Targumiſts*. I have been the longer upon this Matter, both becauſe the *Jew* inſults, and becauſe ſuch an Objection as this may be brought againſt ſeveral other Places of the New Teſtament upon the ſame Account. And I thought a full Anſwer to this might furniſh the Reader wherewithal to anſwer other Objections of the ſame kind.

The

The ſame *Jew* objects (I might ſay he ſcoffs) againſt the Epiſtle of St. *James*. He reckons it worthy of his Scorn and Contempt. It is directed (ſays he) to the twelve Tribes of *Iſrael* diſperſed in the World. But (he goes on) *ubi Jacobus?* Where is this *James?* And where are ten of the twelve Tribes. They were of old (ſays he) in a far, an unknown and inacceſſible Country. And for the other two Tribes of *Judah* and *Benjamin* they were not then diſperſed, nor were they (ſays he) diſperſed till forty and two Years after the Death of *Jeſus*, as he ſays he hath obſerved in another Place: And then (he ſays) *James* was not alive to write to them. XVI. *Num.* 1096.

I anſwer,

1. That the *Hebrews* reckon thoſe *Jews* who are out of their own Land to be of the Diſperſion. When St. *James* writes to the twelve Tribes ſcattered abroad, he writes to all the *Iſraelites* that were any where out of their own Country. And the *Jew* muſt grant there were many that were ſo when St. *James* wrote that Epiſtle. The *Jews ſcattered abroad* are thoſe *Jews* which lived among the *Gentiles*. The *Syriack* Verſion render *ſcattered abroad*, by words that ſignifie as much

much as *diſſeminated among the Gentiles.* He is in the Law of *Moſes* called נדח who lives out of his own Country, *Deut.* 30. v. 4. The LXXII. render that word by Διασπορὰ, which is the word uſed by St. *James* in this place. The very ſame *Hebrew* word is uſed in the ſame Senſe, *Nehemiah* 1. v. 9. and there alſo rendred by the ſame *Greek* word. The *Jew* does not (I hope) pretend that all of the Tribe of *Judah* and *Benjamin* were at that time in their own Land. And if he do he ought to have proved it, and not to have inſulted. He directs his Epiſtle to all the *Iſraelites* whatſoever that were abroad, and therefore he does it by the fitteſt Expreſſion of twelve Tribes; *Iſrael* had ſo many Sons, and this Number comprehends all his Race. It is all one as to the matter in hand when St. *James* died, he might in any part of his Life direct his Epiſtle as he doth.

2. I obſerve how very unfairly the *Jew* deals in this matter. He puts his own Senſe upon the words of St. *James* firſt, and then ridicules him. The ten Tribes lived in a ſtrange Land, and the two were not yet diſperſed; nor were they diſperſed till after St. *James* died. And therefore St. *James* could not write thus. I do not think St. *James* wrote an Epiſtle after his

his Death. The *Jews* know very well who have affirmed that one of their Prophets did ſend a Letter to one of their Kings after he had left the World. But we *Chriſtians* are not put to it to uſe any ſuch Shifts. 'Tis well he will allow ten of the Tribes to be diſperſed: For the other two 'tis enough that any of them at that time lived out of their own Land, and to them only is this Epiſtle directed.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

The CONTENTS.

That the Chriſtian's *Doctrine of the* H. Trinity *is no ſufficient Bar to the* Jew's *embracing the* Chriſtian *Religion. What the New Teſtament teacheth us concerning the* H. Trinity. *The* Jews *pretend that this Doctrine is abſurd and againſt Reaſon, and that it infers Tritheiſm, or a Plurality of Gods. Theſe pretences conſidered. They alſo object that the* Chriſtian's *Doctrine is againſt the Law of* Moſes, *and the Old Teſtament: in anſwer whereunto it is granted that this Doctrine is not clearly revealed in the Old Teſtament; but there are intimations of it there. Several places produced to ſhew that there are in the Old Teſtament intimations of ſome kind of Plurality in the Divine Nature; and more particularly of the Trinity. This ſhewed from the* Jewiſh *Writers. A Teſtimony to this purpoſe from* R. Bechai. *Several other Teſtimonies from the* Rabian. *Of God's creating Man, as 'tis related,* Gen. 1. Pſ. 50. v. 1. *Conſidered, with a place quoted from* Midraſh Tillim. Iſa. *c.* 6. *v.* 3. *with ſome*

ſome Teſtimonies related by P. Galatinus. *Numb.* c. 6. v. 24, &c. *Conſidered, with ſeveral Teſtimonies from the* Hebrew *Doctors.* Deut. 6. v. 4. *conſidered. How thoſe words may be tranſlated. Another Teſtimony out of* Zohar *from a* Jewiſh *Writer. Some Objections againſt what hath been ſaid,* viz. [1] Abravanels, *that* Elohim *is of the ſingular Number. An Anſwer thereto.* [2] *The pretence that the plural* Elohim *is uſed from the Cuſtom of ſpeaking that obtained among the Idolatrous* Canaanites. *An Anſwer at large to that pretenſion.* [3] *A pretence that the Plural is uſed according to the Cuſtom of Kings, who ſpeak of themſelves after the ſame Manner. An Anſwer to this pretenſion.* [4] *An Objection mentioned by* Aben Ezra *on* Gen. 1. v. 26. *but diſapproved by him alſo. An Anſwer to it. A Reflection upon paſſages quoted out of the* Bereſhith Rabba *relating to this Matter. Several places quoted from the* Apocryphal *Books, to prove that the Ancient* Jews *own'd ſome kind of Plurality in the Divine Nature; and that there were among them ſome intimations of the* H. Trinity.

I Shall now proceed to ſhew that the Doctrine of the *Holy Trinity*, as that Do-

Doctrine is delivered in the New Teſtament, is no ſufficient Bar to the *Jew's* embracing the *Chriſtian* Religion.

They do, indeed, upon all occaſions diſpute againſt this Doctrine; and that with great Vehemence: They endeavour to expoſe it and render it ridiculous and incredible: In *Fact*, it is true, that this Doctrine is a Bar hindring them from embracing *Chriſtianity*. This they pretend as a main Obſtacle: And I will admit that in fact, ſo it is; it ſhall be my buſineſs to prove that it ought not to hinder them.

And I am obliged to ſhew (before I go any farther) what it is that the New Teſtament teacheth us concerning the *Holy Trinity*: I chooſe to do it in the very words of Scripture. *There are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt; and theſe three are one*, 1 John 5. 7. Theſe words are very expreſſive of the Scriptural Doctrine concerning the *Holy Trinity*. I very well know ſome have called in queſtion this Text, and ſome (I hope very few) have given it up. It would be, in this place, too great a Digreſſion to enter into that Matter, nor is there any need to do it. Thoſe Men who doubt of the place, and thoſe who are ſo raſh as to give

give it up, yet cannot deny but theſe words contain the Doctrine of the New Teſtament concerning the *Holy Trinity*; nay farther, they do allow that the ſame Doctrine is delivered (though not in theſe words) in other parts of the New Teſtament. But we have no diſpute with the *Jew* in this Matter. The New Teſtament teacheth us that there is but one God; and that one God ought to be owned and worſhipped under the Perſonal Diſtinctions of *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*. It is infinitely plain that theſe are applied to God in the New Teſtament: This is, in ſhort, the Doctrine of the Scriptures of the New Teſtament. I think the *Jew*'s Objections againſt this Doctrine of the New Teſtament are reducible to the following Heads.

Firſt, That this Doctrine is abſurd, againſt Reaſon, and a Contradiction.

Secondly, That it infers *Tritheiſm*, or a Plurality of Gods.

Thirdly, That it is not agreeable to the Law of *Moſes*, but rather repugnant to that Law, and to the Old Teſtament.

Firſt, That this Doctrine is abſurd, againſt Reaſon, and that it implies a Contradiction. All this is eaſily pretended, and ſaid, but can never be proved.

I acknowledge that if it were againſt ſound Reaſon, and if it did imply a Contradiction, it ought not to be received; and my Reaſon is that then we could never be ſure of any thing elſe: For if we admit any Doctrine that is manifeſtly abſurd and againſt Reaſon, we can never be ſure of any thing whatſoever. Upon this Conſideration we juſtly reject the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation:* We are ſure that Doctrine cannot be true; and if it were admitted as true, we ſhould overthrow thoſe Grounds upon which the whole *Chriſtian* Faith is built. If we are not ſure that that Doctrine is falſe, we can never be ſure that the *Chriſtian* Religion is true.

I know very well that it hath been urged by thoſe of the Church of *Rome*, that we ought to admit the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* upon the ſame Grounds on which we admit the Doctrine of the *Trinity:* But the Caſe is not the ſame, as I have elſewhere proved: And that,

Second Dialogue between a *Catholick* Convert and a Proteſtant. Printed, 1687.

1. Becauſe the Doctrine of the *Trinity* is plainly revealed in the New Teſtament; in

in this both ſides are agreed. The other Doctrine is not revealed: So the *Proteſtants* affirm with one Conſent. And thoſe of the Church of *Rome* do grant, that the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* is not clearly revealed in Holy Writ. *Scotus* affirms, as *Bellarmine* confeſſeth (and thinks his Opinion not altogether improbable) that *Tranſubſtantiation* cannot be evidently proved from any expreſs Scripture. Now the Fathers of the Council of *Nice* urge the Text of *H. Writ* againſt the *Arians:* But the Church of *Rome* maintains her Doctrine upon another Bottom, and that is, the Authority and Declaration of the *Church.*

Sabmeron. Tom. 9. Tract. 16.

Bellarm. de Euchar. l. 3. c. 23.

2. The Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* contradicts right Reaſon: It involves an heap of Contradictions: It ſuppoſeth a Change of Subſtance when the Accidents remain; That theſe Accidents can nouriſh or deſtroy; that a Body can be in many Places at once, and broken, and whole at the ſame Time; that a whole Body may be in a point; that every Wafer is the whole Body, and yet the Body but one; that a thing can be divided into two wholes. The Doctrine of the *Trinity* may be *above* our Reaſon, but is not *againſt* it. Beſides, 'tis revealed; and 'tis fit we ſhould believe the Revelation. We

are after all better able to judge of the Nature of Bodies, than of the Spiritual Nature of God. We reject not what our Reaſon does not comprehend: But ſhall we therefore admit what 'contradicts the Reaſon and Senſe of all Mankind?

We believe but one God; nor do we believe that One can be Three in the ſame reſpect it is One; nor that the three Perſons in the *Trinity* are to be underſtood to be Three, as three Men are three Perſons. We do not affirm any thing that undermines the Foundation of all other Knowledge, or that endangers the whole *Chriſtian* Doctrine.

Secondly, It is pretended that this Doctrine will infer *Tritheiſm*, or a Plurality of Gods. This is pretended among the *Jews*; and hence it is that they vehemently clamour againſt this Doctrine, and againſt *Chriſtians* for holding it: But this is altogether a falſe Charge.

We appeal to the New Teſtament, the Rule of our *Chriſtian* Faith. We cannot conceive that there are a Plurality of Gods. It is not poſſible for us to maintain ſuch a *Trinity*, without forſaking at once our *Rule*, and our *Reaſon* alſo. If any private Doctors have given any ſuch Explication of the Doctrine of the *Trinity* as

as does infer ſuch a Plurality of Gods: we diſown ſuch Explications, and this cannot be charged upon our Religion.

Thirdly, It is pretended that this Doctrine is not agreeable to the Law of *Moſes*, but rather repugnant to that Law, and to the Old Teſtament. This the *Jewiſh* Writers do mightily inſiſt upon; and that which they principally urge is, that the Doctrine of the *Chriſtians* infers a Plurality of Gods; which is indeed a Doctrine inconſiſtent with the Old Teſtament, and is a Doctrine which the *Chriſtians* do diſclaim. And then all which the *Jews* can reaſonably pretend under this Head is this, that the Doctrine of the *Trinity* was never revealed to the *Jews* in the Old Teſtament, and therefore is by no means to be admitted: And this Matter, indeed, will require good Conſideration: And for my better and more orderly proceeding, I ſhall diſcourſe under the following Heads.

Firſt, I ſhall readily grant the Doctrine of the *Holy Trinity* was not explicitly and plainly revealed in the Law of *Moſes*, nor in the Old Teſtament. I ſhall not (as ſome have done, both Ancient and Modern Writers) inquire into the Reaſons why this Doctrine was not there

plainly revealed: But ſhall ſhew that the *Jew* will not thereby be ſufficiently excuſed for rejecting *Chriſtianity*, upon the Account of this Doctrine. For there are ſeveral Articles of Faith, and Propoſitions, which are firmly believed by the *Jews*, which are not plainly revealed in the Law of *Moſes*. The *Jews* believe the Reſurrection of the Dead, and everlaſting Life; but will never be able to prove theſe things from any expreſs Teſtimony in the Law of *Moſes*. *Menaſſeh B. Iſrael* hath tried his Skill as to the Doctrine of the Reſurrection; but the Proofs he brings of this Doctrine from the Law of *Moſes* are ſo very ſhort, that, as he will hardly ſatisfie another indifferent Man, ſo he does not ſeem to ſatisfie himſelf. For thus he concludes, *Ex his omnibus liquet, loca nonnulla in libris Moſaicis reperiri, ex quibus licet apodicticis demonſtrationibus fundamentalis & eſſentialis articulus de Reſurrectione mortuorum probari non poſſit, veriſimiliter tamen ex iis evincitur.* And he tells afterwards that he will give an Account why that Article is not more plainly and explicitly delivered in the Law of *Moſes*. The *Jew* is not able from any expreſs Place in the Law of *Moſes* to prove the Article of everlaſting Life; and yet this Article he pretends to believe.

M. B. Iſr. de Reſur. mortuorum, c. 1.

Moſes

Moſes makes no expreſs mention of the Creation of Angels: And yet the *Jews* believe they were God's Creatures. I wou'd preſs the *Jew* to ſhew me any expreſs Doctrine of the Rewards and Puniſhments in the Life to come. If he will attempt to prove this, I will undertake to ſhew him as much Ground to believe the Doctrine of the *Holy Trinity* from that Law.

Secondly, That though this Doctrine be not plainly revealed in the Old Teſtament, yet there are even there fair intimations of it. To ſhew this briefly will be ſufficient at preſent: I ſhall confirm the Truth of it afterwards, from Arguments which to the *Jews* are unexceptionable. I will not undertake to give in a perfect Account of all the intimations of this Doctrine which are to be found in the Old Teſtament; it ſhall be enough that I give ſome Inſtances that are moſt obvious, and moſt material. And *firſt*, I ſhall ſhew that in the Old Teſtament there are ſome Places that intimate ſome kind of *Plurality* in the Divine Nature. And *ſecondly*, that there are other Places that intimate a *Trinity*.

(1.) For thoſe Places which intimate ſome kind of *Plurality*, I ſhall not enlarge, but pitch upon a few: I cannot omit the

very firſt words of the Old Teſtament in the Hiſtory of the Creation. *In the beginning God created*, it is *Bara Elohim.* Gen. 1. v. 1. The Verb is of the ſingular, but the Noun of the plural Number. I add *Gen.* 1. v. 26. *And God ſaid, let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeneſs.* Here we have a Verb of the plural Number, and another Intimation of ſome Plurality. It is farther obſerved that the word *Elohim* is frequently joined to *Verbs* and *Adjectives* of the plural Number. I ſhall take notice of ſome few; the Reader may eaſily collect a greater Number. *v. Gen.* 20. v. 13. *God cauſed me to wander* התעו אתי אלהים; ch. 35. v 7. *God appeared unto him,* נגלו אליו האלהים; Joſh. *ch* 24. *v.* 19. *an holy God* אלהים קדשים, Deut. 5. *v* 26. *living God,* אלהים חיים, To which I ſhall only add, *Eccleſ.* ch. 12. v. 1. *Remember thy Creator*; in the *Hebrew* it is, *Creators*, in the plural Number. This way of ſpeaking does intimate ſome kind of Plurality; though not a Plurality of Gods, as I ſhall endeavour to prove againſt the *Jews* afterwards.

(2.) I add that there are other Places that intimate a *Trinity.* This I will prove from the Hiſtory of the Creation, as it is delivered by *Moſes*, in the Book of *Geneſis.*

But

But this ſhall be done in its proper place: I will in the mean while mention ſome other Places to the ſame purpoſe. The Form of bleſſing the People is very remarkable, where the Name of God is repeated three times; and ſure it is no vain Repetition. *The Lord bleſs thee and keep thee: The Lord make his Face to ſhine upon thee: The Lord lift up his Countenance upon thee, and give thee peace*, Numb. 6. *v.* 24, 25, 26. Again, *The Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Law-giver, the Lord is our King, he will ſave us*, Iſa. 33. v. 22. Again, *O Lord hear, O Lord forgive, O Lord hearken and do*, Dan. *ch.* 9. *v.* 19. The Seraphims in the Prophet cried and ſaid, *Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hoſts*, Iſa. *ch.* 6. v. 3. To which I muſt add what we read, *Pſ.* 50. v. 1. we render it indeed, *the Mighty God*, even *the Lord hath ſpoken*. But there are in the *Hebrew* three Names of God expreſſed, *El*, *Elohim*, and *Jehovah*. Some very Learned men do add thoſe words, *Deut.* 6. 4. which the *Jews* repeat daily, and think it moſt expreſs againſt this Belief of *Chriſtians*. *Hear, O* Iſrael, *the Lord our God, is one Lord.*

Thirdly, That I will appeal to the *Jewiſh* Writers themſelves as to the Truth of what I have affirmed, *viz.* That in the Old

Old Teſtament there are intimations of ſome kind of *Plurality* in the Divine Nature, and of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. Were I to prove the Doctrine of the *Trinity* againſt the *Arians* and *Socinians*, I would take another Method. For though the Teſtimony of the *Old Teſtament* in that Caſe ought not to be deſpiſed, yet that from the *New* would be ſufficient to them who own its Authority, as thoſe Men do. But when I have to do with the *Jews*, I muſt uſe another Method. They deny the Authority of the *New Teſtament*, where this Doctrine is clearly taught; and therefore I muſt inſiſt upon the *Old*, and *their Doctor's* Explication of it. And 'twill be enough, againſt them, to ſhew that there were intimations of this Belief in the *Old Teſtament*, as that was underſtood and expounded by their *Catholick Doctors*; and that ſhall be my next Work.

Bahai in Legem, fol. 4. col. 1. Edit. Cracov.

R. Bechai, a celebrated Author among the *Jews*, diſcourſing of the Word *Elohim*, and of the import and ſignification of it, adds theſe Words: ועל דרך הקבלה השם הזה שתי מלות אל הם והנה הנה פי׳ היוד וזכר את בוראיך מלא ביוד והמשכיל יבין:

That is, *According to the Kabbaliſtical way this Name* Elohim *is two words*, viz. *El Hem*,

Hem, i. e. *They* are *God*. *But then the Explication* of the *Jod* (which is wanting in theſe two words) *is to be fetcht from* Eccleſ. *ch.* 12. v. 1. *Remember thy Creators. He that is prudent will underſtand it.* Theſe words do ſufficiently prove the *Kabbala* among the *Jews*, that though the Divine Nature was but one, yet there was ſome kind of Plurality in this Divine Nature: And this is fairly inſinuated in the *Barah Elohim*, which we find in the Book of *Geneſis*. I ſhall add another Teſtimony to the ſame purpoſe, as I find it in a late learner Writer out of the *Zohar*. I have not that Book by me, but doubt not but the curious Reader, who will take the pains to conſult that Author, will ſoon find the Paſſage. The Author ſpeaking of the word *Elohim*, does it in theſe very words: רוא רמלה ג׳ דרגין אינון וכל דרגא ודרגא בלחודוהי ואעג דכלא חד ומתקשרי בחד ולא יתפרד דא מן דא: i. e: *The Myſtery of* Elohim *is this: There are three Degrees, and every one of theſe Degrees ſubſiſteth by it ſelf, and yet all of them are one, and knit together in one, nor can one be ſeparated from the other.* The ſame Author quotes ſeveral other Paſſages to the ſame purpoſe, which do intimate ſome kind of *Plurality* in the Divine Na-

J. Henr. Maii Synopſ. Theolog. Judaic. pag. 31.

Zohar. in Levit. fol. 29. *col.* 4. *lin* 25. *Edit. Cremon. Ed. Sulzbac. col.* 106.

Ibid. p. 35.

Nature, at leaſt, and ſometimes the *Trinity*. As for Example, *Deut.* 4. 7. We read, אלהים קרבים. He tells us that by that plural Expreſſion is meant the *Supreme* God, the *God* who was called the fear of *Iſaac*, and *Elohim* which he calls
Ibid p. 46. בתראה The ſame Author having quoted, *Deut.* 6. 4. where the Name of God is mentioned three times, adds אלין זכי, i. e. *Theſe are three Degrees with reſpect to this high Myſtery in the beginning, Barah Elo-*
Ibid p. 47. *him.* And elſewhere the ſame Author upon the ſame occaſion ſpeaks more plainly thus, איהו ייחודא וכו', i. e. *This is the Unity* which is called the firſt *Jehova*, our *God*, the *Jehovah*. Behold all is *One*: And therefore it is ſaid אחד *One*, intimating that theſe three Names are *One*: And therefore we read אחד *One*, intimating that they are *One*. This is known ſo to be by the Revelation of the Holy Ghoſt; However it be otherwiſe alſo apparent דתלתא אלין אחד That is, that, THESE THREE ARE ONE.

Ibid p. 56. I cannot omit one Place more of the above-named Author, who ſpeaking of that famous Place, *Deut.* 6. v. 4. *The Lord our God is one Lord*, he adds the following Explication, דהא רוא זכי; That is, *This is the Myſtery of him who was before the Rocks, and is united with the Head, the*

the Stem, ושבילא, i. e. *and the way*; by *Jehovah* (i. e. the first *Jehovah* mentioned, *Deut.* 6. 4.) *is meant the high*, or first, *beginning*; *by the Stem* is *meant the Stem spoken of* (Isa. *ch.* 11.) *the Stem of Jesse*; by *Jehovah* (*viz.* last mentioned in *Deut.* 6. v. 4.) *is meant the way.*

Any Man may perceive that by the second of these is meant the *Messias* (of whom the words *Isa.* 11. v. 1. are by the *Jews* understood.) And perhaps it might be very easie to shew why the *Holy Spirit* is called the *way*. *Teach me to do thy Will, for thou art my God: Thy Spirit is good; lead me into the Land of Uprightness*, Ps. 143. v. 10. Our Saviour tells his Followers that the *Spirit* shall *guide* them into all truth, *John* 16. v. 13. 'Tis Ὁδηγήσει in the *Greek*, he shall be the *way* to the truth, and shall bring you to it.

Before I proceed any farther I will consider some Passages in the first Chapter of *Genesis* relating to the Creation. I would have the *Jews* consider it as it lies in their *Hebrew* Text, to which we *Christians* do appeal. There they may easily find intimations of that truth which I am now contending for. Let them give a good Account if they can of the *Barah Elohim*. 'Tis of little Moment which we find in the *Bereshith Rabbah*, that it is not said *Ba-*

ra

rau in the plural Number. It is certain that the Noun is plural, though the Verb be ſingular: I would fain know of the *Jew* the meaning of this. The *Chriſtians* urge that it is an intimation of one Divine Nature, but that it is alſo an intimation of ſome Plurality, and that only of Perſons. I cannot imagine what ſatisfaction the *Jews* can give in this Matter. If we proceed to *v.* 26. It is ſaid, *Let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeneſs.* Theſe are words that bear very hard upon the *Jews*. They may put what Face upon the Matter they will, but the words will ſtill fly in their Face. They very well know what is ſaid in the *Bereſhith Rabbah* on this occaſion. It is there related that when *Moſes* wrote the Law he gave an Account of the ſeveral Works of Creation day by day; but when he came to write thoſe words, *Gen.* 1. v. 26. *Let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeneſs*; *God* queſtioned him about it, *and demanded of him, why he, after that Manner, gave occaſion to* Hereticks *to open their Mouth.* I quote that Paſſage for this Reaſon only, that I may ſhew that the ancient *Jews* were of opinion, that that Expreſſion of *Moſes* did give ground or occaſion to believe that there is ſome kind of Plurality in the Divine Nature. And there-

V Bereſh. Rabbah, fol 9. col. 2. Edit. Amſtelodam.

therefore it is not to be wondred at that the Ancient *Chriſtians* ſhould even from theſe words be induced to ſuch a Belief. *Epiphanius* ſays expreſly, *That* Adam *was formed, by the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt,* Κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, &c. *according to what is written, when God the Father is brought in ſpeaking to his Son, Let us make Man.* Nor can he be juſtly cenſured for it, it being plain even from the Old Teſtament, that the Divine λόγος, or *Word*, as well as the *Spirit* of God were concerned in the Creation of the World. *By the Word of the Lord were the Heavens made, and all the Hoſt of them, by the Breath of his Mouth,* Pſ. 33. 6. And, *by his Spirit he hath garniſhed the Heavens,* Job 26. 13. And, *the Spirit of God moved upon the Face of the Waters,* Gen. 1. v. 2. That Spirit which *moved*, the *Jews* commonly ſay was the Spirit of the *Meſſias.* Epiphan. Hæreſ. 46. n. 3.

I ſhall now conſider thoſe Places of Scripture that do intimate a *Trinity.* Here I ſhall begin with *Pſ.* 50. v. 1. 'Tis true, as I intimated before, that our *Engliſh* Tranſlation does not give to thoſe words any ſuch *Idea.* I ſhall therefore conſider them as they lie in the *Hebrew* Text, to which I ſhall appeal in this Matter. God is there expreſſed by *El, Elohim* and *Jehovah.* The Author of *Midraſh Tillim* al- Midraſh Tillim in Pſ. 50. v. 1.

lows

lows that theſe are three ſeveral Names of God; for he asketh this queſtion למה וכו׳ *why does he mention the Name of the Bleſſed God three times?* He anſwers thus, *It is to teach thee that the Bleſſed God created his World by theſe three Names, which anſwer to the three Middoth* (or properties) *by which the World was created; and theſe are they, Wiſdom, Knowledge* and *Underſtanding: Wiſdom, as it is ſaid, the Lord by Wiſdom hath founded the Earth; Underſtanding, as 'tis ſaid, by Underſtanding he hath eſtabliſhed the Heavens; Knowledge, as 'tis ſaid, by his Knowledge the Depths were broken up. And thus it is ſaid* (Exod. 20. v. 5.) *I am the Lord, thy God, a jealous God* (*Jehovah, Elohim, El,* are the words there uſed) *Three anſwering to the three, by which the World was made. And thus the Children of* Gad, *and the Children of* Reuben *ſay, El, Elohim, Jehovah; El, Elohim, Jehovah he knoweth. And why are theſe mentioned twice? Becauſe by them the World was made, and the Law was given.* I muſt leave the Reader to make his Reflections upon this very remarkable Paſſage. I ſhall however add what *Joſ. Veiſin* obſerves for the making this Paſſage more uſefull, and it is this, *viz.* That though the *Jews* do on this occaſion induſtriouſly avoid the word

Joſ. 22. 22.

J. Veiſin. in Pug fid. p. 406.

Perſon,

Person, that yet the *Jews* do call these three *Middoth*, in the Book *Jetzira* ההויות, and in the Book called the *Shaare Tsedek*, פנים הפנימים, i.e. *Hypostases* or *Persons*.

I proceed to *Isaiah* ch. 6. v. 3. where the Seraphims cry to each other, *Holy, holy, holy* is *the Lord God of Hosts, the whole Earth is full of his Glory*. I would know of the *Jew* the Cause of this Repetition of the word *Holy* three times; for he cannot suppose it to be a vain Repetition: And though I do not produce the Place as a clear *Proof* of the *Trinity*, yet all things considered, it may be allowed as a fair *intimation* of it: And if what *Galatinus* affirms be admitted, it hath very great weight in this present Argument. *Galatinus* asserts that this Repetition of *Holy* three times does expresly shew to us the three Divine Persons. To prove this he appeals to *R. Simeon*, the Son of *Johai*, and to *Jonathan* the Son of *Uziel* upon this Place. The first of which thus expounds the Place: קדוש זה אב קדוש זה בן קדוש זה רוח הקדוש That is, *Holy*, this is the *Father*; *Holy*, this is the *Son*; *Holy*, this is the *Holy Ghost*: The latter of them in *Chaldee* thus, קדיש אבא קד׳ ברא קד׳ רו׳ קד׳, That is, *Holy, Father*; *Holy, Son*; *Holy, holy Ghost*. For what he says from *R. Simeon*, I can affirm nothing

Petr. Galatin. de Arcanis Cath. verit. lib. 2. c. 1.

upon my own Knowledge: But for what he ſays of *Jonathan*, it is not ſo in the Copies which we now have: But then *Galatinus* affirms poſitively that it was ſo in the Ancient Copies of *Jonathan*, out of which the *Jews* have razed it. He farther avows that he ſaw theſe words in an Ancient Copy at that time when the *Jews* were expelled the Kingdom of *Naples* by the King of *Spain*. The *Jews* will believe as they pleaſe; I ſee no Cauſe to disbelieve him. He poſitively affirms that he ſaw it in an Ancient Copy, and does truly own that it is not to be found in the Modern Copies which we now make uſe of. Be that as it will, this is certain, that as the Seraphims cry *Holy, holy, holy*, three times, of the Lord God of Hoſts, ſo the *Glory* which they aſcribe to him in the following words is acknowledged to be three-fold alſo. To this purpoſe we have a remarkable Paſſage in *R. Bechai* upon the Law. He tells of three Degrees or Excellencies which are in God; and every Degree or Excellency is called כבוד that is, *Glory*, and פנים that is, *Faces*, which, for what I ſee, I may call Πρόσωπα, or Perſons. The firſt Degree or Excellency (ſays he) is called the *Supreme Glory*. The ſecond is called the *Middle Glory*, the third Degree or Excellency

Bechai in Legem, fol. 124. col. 1. Edit. Cracov.

lency is called the *Latter Glory*: And he adds זהו סוד וכו׳, That is, *this is a Myſtery*, &c.

I will next conſider *Numb.* 6. v. 24, 25, 26. where we have an Account of the Form of Bleſſing the People preſcribed to *Aaron*, and to his Sons. *The Lord bleſs thee and keep thee: The Lord make his Face to ſhine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: The Lord lift up his Countenance upon thee, and give thee Peace.* Here is alſo a Repetition of the Name of God three times. The *Chriſtians* will eaſily believe that there is in theſe words an intimation of the *Trinity*: For this bears a great Conformity to what we read in the New Teſtament; whence we are obliged to be baptized into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, *Matth.* 28. And the Apoſtolical Bleſſing runs in this Form. *The Grace of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghoſt be with you all*, 2 Cor. 13. v. 14. To which I muſt add the words of St. *John*: *Grace be unto you and Peace from him which is, and which was, and which is to come*, Rev. *ch.* 1. v. 4. This latter place I name the rather upon the Account of what *R. Bechai* obſerves upon the words before recited from the Book of *Numbers*. He obſerves the Name *Jehovah* repeated three times, with reſpect to the three ſe-

R. Bechai. in Pentat. fol. 169. *col.* 2. *Edit. Cracov.*

veral times, the *preſent*, *paſt*, and *future*, which the Divine Being hath a Power over. Of him it may be ſaid that *he is*, *he was*, and *is to come*, or will for ever be. But it will be more material to my preſent purpoſe to take notice of what the *Jewiſh* Writers obſerve in the very Ancient and Celebrated Book called *Bahir*, on this occaſion. He ſays that the repeating *Jehovah* three times in this place teacheth us, *that theſe Names of the Bleſſed God are three Powers, and adds*, וכל חיל וחיל דומה לחברו ושמו כשמו, i. e. *Every diſtinct Power is like to each other, and hath the ſame Name with it.* That is to ſay, as is evident from the words of that Author, *Every one is, and is called* Jehovah. The ſame Author adds, that in the words of the *Pſalmiſt*, where it is ſaid, the *Lord Reigneth*, that *the words bear witneſs of the three* הויות (the word ſignifies *Exiſtencies* or *Subſiſtencies*) *which are in the Bleſſed Creator. And what is ſaid that all is cloſed with* Jehovah, *the peculiar Name of God, intimates that he is the Fountain of all, and from him are the Emanations of all: He adds that it is ſaid in the Book* Zohar, *that in thoſe words, The Lord Reigneth, there is a great Myſtery.* But I will not purſue this Matter any farther in this place: they who are curious

Bahai ib. & R. M. Markanti in Leg. fol. 173 col. 1. Edit. Venet.

Ibid. col. 3.

curious may ſee more in the Authors which are quoted in the Margent. I do not think that I need inſiſt particularly on the words of *Iſaiah*, ch. 33. v. 22. which is parallel to what I mentioned laſt, at leaſt as to my preſent occaſion. And for the ſame Reaſon I paſs by *Dan.* ch. 9. v. 19.

I ſhall proceed to the famous place, *Deut.* ch. 6. v. 4. *Hear O* Iſrael, *the Lord our God is one Lord.* This is recited daily by the *Jews*, and they think it bears very hard upon the *Chriſtian's* Belief of the *Holy Trinity*. And indeed ſo it would if the *Chriſtians* did believe a Plurality of Gods. But they need not fear this, or any other place of the Old Teſtament which the *Jews* are able to produce. They believe the Doctrine contained in this Scripture as ſincerely as the *Jews* do; and appeal in this Matter to the Ancient *Jews* themſelves, who have given ſuch an Account of theſe words, as is ſo far from deſtroying and ſubverting their Belief of the *Holy Trinity*, that it mightily promotes and advanceth it. And whatever the *Jews* may conceit, I doubt not but to make it appear that, if the *Jews* will but admit the Interpretation of their Ancient Doctors upon this place, they will ſoon find the *Chriſtian* Doctrine con-

firmed greatly, and themſelves confuted by their own Writers.

Thoſe words which we tranſlate thus, *The Lord our God is one Lord*, may be tranſlated thus, *the Lord, our God, the Lord*, are *One*. This agrees perfectly with the *Hebrew* Text יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד, and the *Peſik* between the two laſt words requires ſome Pauſe or Stop. So that this Verſion is exactly agreeable to the *Hebrew* Words and to the Accent, and (as will appear more afterwards) to the Interpretation of the Ancient *Jewiſh* Doctors. This Verſion agrees perfectly with that Explication of the *Zohar* mentioned above, where that Author, ſpeaking of theſe words, ſays expreſly, that theſe Three are One. I ſhall add to what I have obſerved before, another Teſtimony out of *Zohar* from a *Jew*: So that the *Jews* ought not to ſuſpect a Writer of their own in this Matter, how prone ſoever they are to ſuſpect the Quotations of *Chriſtians*. That Author gives an Account of theſe words, and explains them in that Order in which they lie before us in the Text. He begins with *Jehovah* firſt mentioned. And thus he ſaith, יהוה וכו׳, That is, *Jehovah* is *the Head* (or beginning) *of all things*, in Splendor, Antiquity and Holineſs; and he is called the FATHER.

Markani in Legem, fol. 194. col. 3.

Elo-

Elohenu, i. e. Our God, *is the Profundity of Rivers and Springs which go forth and flow unto all things.* And then he adds of the *Jehovah* laſt mentioned, that he is the *Tree*, &c. I preſume he ſpeaks of the *Kabbaliſtical* Tree, which is another of the Divine *Sephiroth*, by whom the World was *created*, the בינה or תבונה by which the World was made, ſee *Prov.* 3. v. 19. my Author goes on, *And all is one, one is knit to the other, and there is not found any Separation, but All are One.* He tells us afterwards that this *Myſtery* was to be revealed in the Days of the *Meſſias*. *V. Buxtorf. Lexic. Talmud.* אילן

Before I proceed any farther in this Argument, I ſhall take off ſome Objections that are laid in my way againſt ſome particulars above-mentioned; which are ſuch as ſome pretend will not bear the weight and ſtreſs which I have laid upon them.

The firſt Objection which I ſhall mention ſhall be what I find in *Abravenel*, who after he hath refuted (as he thought) an Opinion of *Nachman*, endeavours to prove that *Elohim* is not a *Plural*, but that it is a *Singular* as much as *El* is. He tells us that to *El* two Letters, indeed, of the *Tetragrammaton* are added, according to a ſaying among their Wiſe-men, that *Obj.* 1. *Abravenel in Legem, fol.* 6. *c.* 3.

God created the World *with two Letters*. And that for the Termination of the word, that is no Proof that it is of the plural Number, becauſe there are ſeveral words of that Termination, which are *Singular*, and denote individual Perſons, as *Mizraim*, and *Ephraim*.

I anſwer,

Anſw. 1. That though the Termination of *Elohim* do very frequently denote a Plural, yet no wiſe *Chriſtian* lays the whole ſtreſs upon that. I have ſhewed that *Elohim*, beſides its plural Termination, is joined with Verbs and with Adjectives in the plural Number. When he contends that *Elohim* is of the ſingular Number, he knows that the Nation of the *Jews* is againſt him. 'Tis very well if he believed otherwiſe himſelf. I am ſure after all his Pains to prove this a ſingular Word, he betakes himſelf to a new Method to get himſelf clear of this Difficulty, which is ſo much the more ſurprizing, becauſe this his Opinion, that *Elohim* is a Singular, and made up of *El* and his additional Letters of the *Tetragrammaton*, he ſays, a little before, is the Truth of the Matter בלי ספק, That is, *without doubt*. If he really believed it himſelf, he needed not have ſought out another Method.

2. Where-

2. Whereas he would have his Reader believe that *Elohim* is made up of *El*, and his two other Letters, we have nothing but his word, no Manner of Proof of it. I know that *Jew* too well to take this from him upon Truſt. But beſides this, it is very well known that the ſingular Number of *Elohim* is not *El*, but *Eloha*, from which 'tis probable 'tis taken, as *Jah* from *Jehovah*. For his Names of *Mizraim* and *Ephraim*, he might have ſpared his Pains, till any *Chriſtian* had laid a greater ſtreſs upon the bare Termination.

It is objected farther (not by a *Jew*; I ſpeak it with trouble when I ſay, by a *Chriſtian*) that the uſing of a Plural to expreſs the Name of God is derived from *Polytheiſts*, who uſed this way of ſpeaking. The *Hebrews* lived in *Paleſtine* among the Idolatrous *Canaanites*, who worſhipped *falſe Gods*, and accordingly ſpoke of them in a word of the plural Number; and thence it was, with compliance with that Uſage of theſe Idolaters, that the word *Elohim* is uſed in the *Holy Scripture*, of the *True God*. The *Hebrews* uſed, indeed, a Verb in the ſingular Number in conjunction with *Elohim*, and by that Method diſowned *Polytheiſm* them- *Obj.* 2.

themſelves; and when they joined it with a Plural in compliance with the Uſage of the Idolaters, yet they were no *Polytheiſts* themſelves. I anſwer,

1. This is indeed ſaid but not proved, nor ſo much as probable. For is it probable that the *Holy Ghoſt* (by whom the Holy Writers were inſpired) ſhould uſe this Method? That he ſhould imitate the way of ſpeaking uſed by theſe Idolatrous *Canaanites?* That he ſhould do it when it could not but be very dangerous to the Souls of Men! 'Tis certain that the *Hebrews* did not want words enough to expreſs the Name of God by, which were of the ſingular Number, and which they many times uſe. We well know that great Care was taken to warn the *Hebrews* not to imitate the Uſages and Practices of the *Canaanites:* And do we think they were left at liberty to ſpeak of the true God in thoſe Terms which were uſed of Idols? The word *Baal* was forbid the *Iſraelites*, becauſe it was a word that had been applied to an Idol. *Thou ſhalt call me* Iſhi, *and ſhalt call me no more* Baali. *For I will take away the Names of* Baalim *out of her Mouth, and they ſhall no more be remembred by their Name*, Hoſ. 2. v. 16, 17. And yet the word *Baal* did not always import an Idol; it was indeed fre-

frequently applied that way. According to the Objector's Opinion, the true God is often meant by *Elohim*; which was the very word by which the filthy *Canaanites* ordinarily called their Idols and falſe Gods. Here are great Preſumptions againſt this Novel and Upſtart Opinion.

2. If it to be ſaid that the *Holy Ghoſt* did not chooſe words for the Holy and Inſpired Writers, I will not in this preſent Queſtion debate that Matter: I will ſuppoſe it ſo to be. Yet ſtill it cannot be ſuppoſed that the Holy Writers, when they ſpake of God, would do it in a manner that was ſo ſcandalous and dangerous; that they would ſpeak of him in ſuch Terms as the Idolaters were wont to apply to their Idols. Much leſs is it to be ſuppoſed that God himſelf ſhould uſe ſuch Terms, in that Law which he himſelf wrote; that this ſhould be written by the Finger of God, is incredible: And yet we know God ſtiles himſelf *Elohim*, Exod. 20. & Deut. 5. *V. S. Edzardi Diſſertation. de nomine Elohim.*

3. I would fain know of theſe Objectors, when, and where the Patriarchs changed their own Language? Was it when they (few in Number) ſojourned in the Land of *Canaan*? Or was it in *Egypt* that they did it? where they were 215 Years, or at leaſt 210. They will not

not I ſuppoſe pretend that they changed it in *Egypt*; notwithſtanding their long ſtay there. *Moſes*, who was born there, and bred up at Court, and was learned in all the *Egyptian* Learning, yet did not write his Law in the *Egyptian* Language. The Objectors do not ſo much as affirm this. But was it done when they were Sojourners in *Canaan*? How does this appear? For it is not enough to ſuppoſe it. It is a Matter of greater Weight than to be taken upon Truſt. It cannot be denied but God ſpake to *Abram*, when he ſent him out of his own Country toward the Land of *Canaan*: And it muſt be allowed that he ſpake to him in his own Language, which *Abram* underſtood. *Abram* had thoſe about him in *Canaan* which underſtood this Language. *Abram* had that abhorrence of the Idolatrous *Canaanites*, that he would not be buried with them, but bought a ſeparate Place for the Burial of himſelf and Family. He would not enter into Affinities with them, but ſends his Servant for a Wife for his Son into his own Country. His Son *Iſaac* trod in his ſteps in this matter, and his Wife ſufficiently declared her abhorrence of ſuch an Affinity. *Jacob*, we know, went into *Abraham*'s Country for a Wife. After all, can we think they were

were ſo fond of the Language of *Canaan*, that for the ſake of that they did forego and forget their own? Suppoſing they underſtood that Language when they ſojourned there, does it follow that they retained it in *Egypt* alſo, for above 200 Years together? Muſt *Moſes* be ſuppoſed to write his Books in the Language of *Canaan*, who was never there? He uſeth the word *Elohim*; but whence did he learn it? Sure not from the *Canaanites*, with whom he had no Converſation. To learn the Language of *Aſhdod*, and to forget their own, was a Reproach to the *Hebrews* in after-times, *Neh.* ch. 13. 25.

4. I add that this Opinion is Novel and Singular, and directly contrary to the Senſe of the Fathers of the Primitive-Church. For this I dare appeal to all thoſe who are converſant in their Writings. They argued as we do; and believed the Doctrine of the *Holy Trinity* to be at leaſt intimated in the Old Teſtament: And laid a great ſtreſs upon the words uſed in the beginning of *Geneſis*, which relates the Hiſtory of the Creation. And we ought to have that Deference for them as not to depart from them without very good reaſon.

Obj. 3. It is farther objected that this *Plural* way of ſpeaking is כמנהג מלכים, according to the Manner of *Kings*, who ſpeak of themſelves in the plural Number.

I anſwer,

1. That we have no ſufficient Proof of this: I do not find any thing offered to this purpoſe. And if a bare Affirmation were enough, we ſhall never fail of enough of that from the *Jewiſh* Writers.

2. That the Matter of Fact is not true, when 'tis ſaid to be the Manner of Kings to ſpeak in the plural Number. I grant that ſo it is now; but 'twas not ſo when *Moſes* wrote his Law. We have plenty of Inſtances to the contrary. *Pharaoh*, *David*, *Nebuchadnezzar* ſpeak of themſelves in the Singular, not plural Number. And 'tis a very extravagant Fanſie to ſuppoſe that *Moſes* alludes to a Cuſtom that was not (for what appears) in Being at that time, nor a great while after. This puts me in mind of a like extravagant Conceit of a *German* Divine, that hath commented upon *Geneſis*. On *Geneſis* ch. 2. v. 7. *breathed into his Noſtrils the Breath of Life*, he tells us that *it is not inelegantly by ſome obſerved that this is a Metaphor drawn from Glaſs-makers, who by their Breath make their Cups and Glaſſes*

Poreus in Gen. 2. v. 7.

Glaſſes into their ſeveral Forms. That Divine ſhould have been ſure that this Art of blowing Glaſſes had been as old as that Expreſſion of *Moſes*, before he had commended a Metaphor which he fancies might be drawn from thence. The like might be ſaid of this Conceit here, in the laſt named Objection.

Aben Ezra mentions an Objection, in his Comment on *Gen.* 1. v. 26. where it is ſaid, *Let us make Man.* He ſays that it is pretended that the word נעשה is not a Future of the Active Voice, but that it is in *Niphal*, and ſignifies as much as *is made*; but then what follows, *in our Image*, which bears againſt that Senſe of the word, muſt be the word of *Moſes*, and imply only *humane* likeneſs, that is, ſuch as that of *Moſes* was. *Obj.* 4. *Aben Ezra in* Gen. 1. 26.

I anſwer,

As *Aben Ezra* does, and it deſerves no better, that this is פרוש חסר לב, That is, *a fooliſh Interpretation.* The Context it ſelf will not admit it. For Man was not then made, but we have an Account of his Creation after this, *v.* 27. *So God created Man* (not in the Image of *Moſes*, but) in his own Image.

I find the *Jews* at a great ſtand when they mention *Gen.* 1. 26. They blunder at

at a ſtrange rate, and know not how to extricate themſelves out of the Difficulty. This may appear from what we find in the *Bereſhith Rabba*. On thoſe words, *Let us make Man:* It is ſaid, *with whom did he adviſe? R. Joſhua* in the Name of *R. Levi* ſays, *with his Works of Heaven and Earth, like a King that had two Counſellors, and would do nothing without them.* R. Samuel *the Son of* Nachman *ſays, that he adviſed with every day's Work. Another* R. *ſays, that he adviſed* בלבו *with his own Heart.* R. Chaninah *ſays, with his miniſtring Angels.*

Fol. 10. *c.* 1. *Edit. Amſtelod.*

Thus diverſly and extravagantly do the *Jews* deliver themſelves on this Occaſion. They fooliſhly ſuppoſe God to adviſe with his Creatures, and even with the Earth it ſelf. The Angels ſhall be brought into Counſel, who are not ſo much as mentioned in the Hiſtory of the Creation. But theſe Men do not ſeem to conſider what follows, *in our Image.* Do they ſuppoſe Man made in the Image of any of the Creatures? If they do, they may ſoon be confuted from the next words, where it is ſaid, he created in *his own Image.*

But it is now time to return to my Argument. I ſhall therefore in the *next* Place conſider ſome Paſſages in the Apocryphal

cryphal Books, to prove that the Ancient *Jews* had among them ſome Notion of ſome *Plurality* in the Divine Nature, and of the *Holy Trinity*. Though theſe Apocryphal Books be not received into the Canon of Scripture, yet they muſt be owned to be written by the *Jews*, and to contain the Senſe of that Nation in this Matter; and to have at leaſt as good Authority as the *Targums*, and other celebrated Authors among the Ancient *Hebrews*: And though we may not expect ſuch clear Teſtimonies for the *Holy Trinity* as we have in the *New Teſtament*, where this Doctrine is explicitely revealed; yet will it be of great Moment, if we find ſuch Expreſſions, as intimate that there was a *Jewiſh Kabbala* concerning this Doctrine, and ſo confirm that more expreſs Revelation which we have of it in the *New Teſtament*.

And here I will be very brief. A late very learned Writer, and my very worthy Friend, hath very happily prevented me in this Matter; and to him I refer the Learned and Curious Reader, for a larger Account and more ample Satisfaction. Judgment of the *Jewiſh* Church againſt the *Unitarians*, ch. 9.

He very well obſerves that the *Jews* from *Gen.* 1. v. 26. were ſenſible of ſome kind of Plurality in the Divine Nature;

and that he does from the Prayer of young *Tobias* thus expreſſed, *Thou madeſt* Adam, *and gaveſt him* Eve *his Wife for an helper and ſtay; of them came Mankind: Thou haſt ſaid, it is not good that Man ſhould be alone. LET US MAKE unto him an Aid like unto himſelf*, Tobit 8. *v.* 6. It is Ποιήσωμεν, the very ſame word that is uſed by the LXXII. *Gen.* 1. v. 26. And that alſo tho' the word uſed *Gen.* 2. v. 18. be of the ſingular Number. The Author of the Book of *Wiſdom* aſcribes the Creation of the World to the *Word*, ch. 9. v. 1. And diſtinguiſheth between *Wiſdom* (or the *Word*) v. 2. and the *Holy Spirit*, v. 17. This *Wiſdom* he elſewhere calls the *Worker of all things*, ch. 7. v. 22. having *all Power*, v. 23. *The brightneſs of the everlaſting Light, and Image of God's Goodneſs*, v. 26. We find a diſtinct Acknowledgement of *Father* and *Son*, Ecclus. 50. v. 10. we have an Account that the *Word* and *Binah* were before all things; and thoſe in the *Jewiſh* Books are put for the Divine λόγος and Spirit. *Wiſdom hath been created before all things, and the Underſtanding of Prudence from Everlaſting. The word of God moſt high is the Fountain of* Wiſdom, *and her ways are everlaſting Commandments*, Ecclus. *ch.* 1. v. 4, 5. The *Spirit* of the *Lord* is ſaid to *fill the* World.

Wiſd.

Wiſd. chap. 1. verſ. 7. There is another Paſſage ſtill which I find mentioned by the very Learned Author above-named, which I take to be a very clear Teſtimony of the Incarnation of the Deity. The words are to be found in *Baruch*, ch. 3. v. 35, 36, 37. *This is our God: And there ſhall none other be accounted of in compariſon of him. He hath found out all the way of Knowledge, and hath given it to* Jacob *his Servant, and to* Iſrael *his Beloved. Afterward did he ſhew himſelf upon Earth, and converſed with Men.* This is a Paſſage ſo piquant and pertinent to my Purpoſe, that I think it of mighty force in my preſent Argument againſt the *Jews*.

If theſe things be put all together, and the whole Evidence ſummed up, they muſt be of great force in the preſent Queſtion, and enough to convince us that the Ancient *Jews* did believe ſome Plurality in God, and had good Reaſon ſo to do: And that there is in the Old Teſtament ground to believe this, and ſome obſcure Intimation at leaſt of the *Holy Trinity*. But for a fuller Proof of this againſt the *Jews*, I muſt refer the Reader to the following Chapter.

Mean while as to what has been ſaid already, I find that *J. A. Amram* the *Jew* reflects upon the *Kabbaliſtical* way of proving

Jac. Aben Amram, n. 141.

ving the *Trinity*. He ſays that ſome *Chriſtians* uſe this Method: But he ſays that this Theology is above the Vulgar; that it contains, indeed, abſtruſe Myſteries, but under ſuch cortical Coverings that the Vulgar cannot come at the Kernel. He adds that the moſt skilfull *Hebrew* Divines of this ſort do teach the moſt ſimple Unity of God, cloathed with many Supreme Attributes; and therefore thinks the very ignorant can never prove the *Trinity* from them.

I am ſomething ſurprized with this weak Reflection from ſo ſubtil and learned a *Jew*. I think it much below him: I cannot but take notice of this Reflection.

Firſt, He ſays this Learning is above the Vulgar and moſt Ignorant: And doubtleſs ſo it is. But then we are not to think that they are the Men that uſe theſe ſort of Arguments. We do not reckon this among the popular ways of arguing. The moſt learned Men in the World, and moſt converſant in the *Jewiſh* Learning, have produced ſuch pregnant Proofs of this kind, as no *Jew* will be able to anſwer. However he might have attempted it, and tried what he could have anſwered to thoſe Paſſages produced out of *Zohar*, and other *Kabbaliſtical* Books, in behalf of this *Chriſtian* Doctrine. *Se-*

Secondly, He ſays the *Kabbaliſtical* Divines own the *Unity* of God. I believe this alſo, but this is nothing to his Purpoſe; for ſo do the *Chriſtians* too, who yet believe the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. We are agreed that there is but ONE God. And it does not thence follow that what the *Chriſtians* teach from the New Teſtament, concerning the *Trinity*, was not agreeable to what the *Jews* taught alſo.

CHAP. V.

The CONTENTS.

The Teſtimony of Philo *the* Jew, *concerning the* H. Trinity, *and the* λόγος. *A Fragment of his out of* Euſebius, *with a Reflection upon it. His Account of the Cherubims and flaming Sword. Its agreeableneſs to the Sacred Writers. A Paſſage of* Origen *to the ſame purpoſe. His Account of the three Perſons mentioned,* Gen. 18. *Some Reflections upon that Account with relation to the* Chriſtian's *Account of the* H. Trinity. *Some other Places out of* Philo *the* Jew *to the ſame purpoſe, with Reflections upon them. The Account which* Philo *gives of the* λόγος. *He makes the* Manna *a Symbol of the* λόγος. *He ſpeaks in this agreeably to the other* Jewiſh *Writers, and to what we read in the New Teſtament.* Philo *owns the* λόγος *to be the Governour of the World, the Son of God, and that he was begotten Eternally, and that he is* NECESSARILY *immortal. The Rows of precious Stones on* Aaron's *Breſt-plate a Symbol of the* λόγος. *A very remarkable Place of* Philo *to that purpoſe.*

purpoſe. The λόγος conſidered by Philo *as an Advocate. That the λόγος cannot be a Creature is ſhewn from another Paſſage in* Philo. *He calls the λόγος the* Angel *mentioned*, Exod. 23. *v.* 23. *And the true High-Prieſt. He affirms the* Levitical *High-Prieſt to be a Type or Symbol of the λόγος. He expounds theſe words*, Zech. 6. 12. Behold the Man whoſe Name is the BRANCH, *of the λόγος. He affirms him to be the Mediator between God and Man; To be not Unbegotten as the Father, and not Begotten as Men. The Subſtance of* Philo's *Evidence ſummed up. The* Chaldee *Paraphraſts conſidered in this Matter. They ſpeak of the λόγος as of a Divine Perſon: Several Teſtimonies to this purpoſe out of* Onkelos, *and from the Paraphraſe of* Jonathan, *and that of* Jeruſalem. *An Objection of an* Anti-trinitarian: *An anſwer* to that Objection. *Of the* Shechinah.

I Shall now proceed to lay before the *Jews* what their Countryman *Philo* hath ſaid in Confirmation of the *Chriſtian* Doctrine concerning the *Holy Trinity*, the Son of God, and the Divine λόγος.

I shall begin with a Fragment of *Philo*'s mentioned by *Eusebius*, who cites *Philo* speaking of God's Creation of Man, in the following words. ΔΙΑ τί, ὡς περὶ ἑτέρου Θεοῦ φησὶ τὸ, ἐν εἰκόνι Θεοῦ ἐποίησα τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ; παγκάλως καὶ σοφῶς τουτὶ κεχρησμώδηται· θνητὸν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἀπεικονισθῆναι πρὸς τὸν ἀνωτάτω καὶ πατέρα τῶν ὅλων ἐδύνατο, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν δεύτερον Θεὸν, ὃς ἐστιν ἐκείνου Λόγος· ἔδει γὰρ τὸν λογικὸν ἐν ἀνθρώπου ψυχῇ τύπον, ἀπὸ θείου Λόγου χαραχθῆναι, ἐπειδὴ ὁ πρὸ τοῦ Λόγου Θεὸς, κρείσσων ἐστὶν ἢ πᾶσα λογικὴ φύσις· τῷ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν Λόγον, ἐν τῇ βελτίστῃ καί τινι ἐξαιρέτῳ καθεστῶτι ἰδέᾳ, οὐδὲν θέμις ἦν γεννητὸν ἐξομοιοῦσθαι· i. e. *Why does God say, in the Image of God made I Man, and not in his own Image? This Scripture-expression is for wise and good Reasons; for nothing mortal can be fashioned after the Image of the Supreme God and Father of all things, but of his word or* λόγος, *who is the second God. For the Rational part of Man's Soul, ought to receive its Impression from the Word or Reason of God, because God himself, who is Superior to his* λόγος, *is beyond the Nature of all Rational Beings; and consequently it was not fit that any Created Being should be made after his Likeness, whose Nature doth subsist in the highest Degree of Excellence.*

Euseb. *præpar. Evangel.* l. 7. cap. 13. *Paris.* 1628.

I could

I could not justifie a *Christian* that should say that the λόγος is the second God, because this might insinuate that there were more Gods than One: But this does not render the Testimony of *Philo* useless. His words are of great use in the present Question: For first he does distinguish between the Person of the *Father*, and the λόγος (whom he elsewhere calls the *Son*:) And secondly, he does expresly affirm this λόγος or *Son* to be God. And consequently that he did acknowledge some kind of Plurality in the Divine Nature, which can be nothing more or less than a Plurality of Persons; as, I presume, will appear before I have done with this Matter.

The next Place I shall take notice of is where he discourseth of the *Cherubims* and *flaming Sword* mentioned, *Gen.* 3. 24. He gives his Allegorical Interpretation of the Cherubims and flaming Sword; the former he makes a Representation of the two Hemispheres, the latter a Symbol of the Sun: But after all he proceeds, and adds, Ἤκουσα δέ ποτε καὶ σπουδαιοτέρου λόγου παρὰ ψυχῆς ἐμῆς εἰωθυίας τὰ πολλὰ θεολητεῖσθαι, καὶ περὶ ὧν οὐκ οἶδε μαντεύεσθαι, ὃν ἐὰν δύνωμαι ἀπομνημονεύσας ἐρῶ· ἔλεγε δέ μοι, κατὰ τὸν ἕνα ὄντως ὄντα θεὸν δύο τὰς ἀνωτάτω εἶναι καὶ πρώτας δυνάμεις, ἀγαθότητα καὶ ἐξουσίαν· ἀγαθότητι

Philo *Allegor.* l. 2. p. 86. F.

θότητι μὲν τὸ πᾶν γεφυρηκέναι· ἐξουσίᾳ δὲ, τοῦ γεννηθέντος ἄρχειν· τρίτον δὲ συναγωγὸν ἀμφοῖν μέσον εἶναι λόγον· λόγῳ γὰρ καὶ ἄρχοντα καὶ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι τὸν θεόν· ἀρχῆς μὲν οὖν καὶ ἀγαθότητος τῶν δυεῖν δυνάμεων τὰ Χερουβὶμ εἶναι σύμβολα· λόγου δὲ τὴν φλογίνην ῥομφαίαν· ὀξυκινητότατον γὰρ καὶ θερμὸν λόγος, καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ αἰτίου, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸ πάντα φθάσαν παρημείψατο, καὶ πρὸ πάντων νοούμενον, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι φαινόμενον, i. e. *But my own Soul, which sometimes is Divinely transported, and delivers Oracles not known to it self, hath given me a more exact Account, which I will indeavour to recollect and report. It said unto me, that to the truly one God there were two Supreme and Primary Powers belonging, Goodness and Power. And by Goodness all things were made, and were governed by Power. That there was still a third as a Conciliator in the midst of the two former,* viz. *the*
λόγος *Word. That by this Word, God is both a Governour and Good, and that the Cherubims are Symbols of these two Powers of Government and Goodness, and the flaming Sword of the Word. For the* λόγος *or word, was very swift and fervent, especially that of the first Cause; it being in time before all things understood, and appearing above all.* After this manner of speaking does he in the foregoing words, as also in those which follow, give an Account

count of the Divine Being: and plainly aſſerts at the ſame time the Unity of the Divine Eſſence. To what *Philo* ſays here of the λόγος or word, of which he makes the flaming Sword a Symbol, he ſpeaks conformably in another Place; where ſpeaking of God's cutting and dividing the United Natures of things, he adds that he does it τῇ τομεῖ τῇ συιαπάντων αὐτῷ λόγῳ, *i. e.* by his λόγος or *word*, Cutting or *dividing all things*. This is very agreeable to what we read, *Heb.* 3. 12. *The word of God is quick and powerful, and ſharper than any Two-edged Sword, piercing even to the dividing aſunder of Soul and Spirit, and of the Joints and Marrow, and is a diſcerner of the Thoughts and Intents of the Heart.*

It appears from what hath been ſaid before, how agreeable what *Philo* ſays of the λόγος, is to what the Author of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* ſpeaks of the λόγος. I may add, that it agrees alſo with what we read, *Wiſdom* ch. 18. *v.* 15, 16. *Thine Almighty Word leapt down from Heaven, out of thy Royal Throne, as a fierce Man of War, into the Midſt of a Land of Deſtruction; and brought thine unfeigned Commandment as a ſharp Sword*, &c. And as *Philo* agrees with this *Jewiſh* Writer, ſo they both agree with the Author of the

Apo-

Apocalypse, Rev. 19. 13, 15, 21. compared with *Chap.* 1. v. 16. and *Ch.* 2. v. 16. where the Word of God is described with a sharp Sword going out of his Mouth. And how agreeable all this is with the Prophecy of *Isaiah* concerning the *Messias*, hath been observed by one of the Ancient *Christians*. I shall not think much to transcribe his words upon this occasion, and his words are these; Ἐν δὲ τῷ ἡσαΐᾳ ἔφασκεν ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τεθεῖσθαι αὐτοῦ τὸ στόμα ὡς μάκαιραν ὀξεῖαν, καὶ κεκρύφθαι ὑπὸ τὴν σκέπην τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ, βέλει ἐκλεκτῷ ὡμοιωμένος, καὶ ἐν τῇ φαρέτρᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς κεκρυμμένος, δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν ὅλων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καλούμενος, καὶ ἰσραὴλ, καὶ φῶς ἐθνῶν· μάκαιρα μὲν οὖν ὀξεῖά ἐστι τὸ στόμα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐπεὶ ζῶν τυγχάνει ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἐνεργὴς, καὶ τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάκαιραν δίστομον, καὶ διϊκνούμενος ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος, ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν, καὶ κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας, ἄλλως τε καὶ ἐλθὼν οὐκ εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, τουτέστιν ἐπὶ τὰ σωματικὰ καὶ αἰσθητὰ, βαλεῖν, ἀλλὰ μάκαιραν, καὶ διακόπτων τὴν, ἵν' οὕτως εἴπω, ἐπιβλαβῆ φιλίαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος, ἵν' ἡ ψυχὴ ἐπιδιδοῦσα αὐτὴν τῷ στρατευομένῳ κατὰ τῆς σαρκὸς πνεύματι, φιλιωθῇ τῷ θεῷ. That is, *It is said in* Isaiah, *that the Father made his Mouth like a sharp Sword, and that he was hidden in the shadow of his Hand, and likened*

Origen in Joannem. Coloniæ, 1685. pag. 34.
Isa. 49.
Heb. 4.12.

likened to a poliſhed Shaft, and hidden in his Quiver, and was called the Servant of God, and Iſrael, *and a Light to the Gentiles. Therefore is the Mouth of the Son of God a ſharp Sword. The Word of God is quick and powerful, and ſharper than any Two-edged Sword, piercing even to the dividing aſunder of Soul and Spirit, and of the Joints and Marrow, and is a diſcerner of the Thoughts and Intents of the Heart; he coming not to ſend Peace upon the Earth, that is upon corporeal and ſenſible Things, but a Sword; cutting aſunder the hurtfull Friendſhip between the Soul and Body, that the Soul permitting it ſelf to the Spirit, that wars againſt the Fleſh, might be at friendſhip with God.* By this it appears that *Philo* ſpeaks of the λόγος in the ſame Terms, and under the ſame *Idea* and Character that the Holy Writers made uſe of, both *Jews* and *Chriſtians*. I very well know that *Abravenel* (as well as ſome of the other *Jews*) underſtands the words above cited to be meant not of the *Meſſias*, but of the Prophet *Iſaiah*. It would be too great a Digreſſion in this place to enter into that Debate. There is no indifferent Perſon can make any doubt of that Matter, that conſiders the Context with due Application of Mind.

Philo hath another Paſſage in his ſecond Book of Allegories, ſomething to the ſame purpoſe with that firſt abovenamed, which I will not now inſiſt upon.

But elſewhere he hath a Paſſage more clearly relating to the ſame purpoſe. He tells us that the *Soul fully enlightened* Τρίτην φαντασίαν ὑπὸ ὑποκειμένου καταλαμβάνει, i. e. *Receives as it were a three-fold Image of one Subject.* He goes on and tells us, that there *is one Father of all things,* who *in the Scripture is called* Ὁ ὤν, *or he who is.* But he *who IS is attended with his moſt ancient and neareſt Powers; of which one is* Creative, *the other* Kingly *or* Governing. *The firſt is called God, by which he made and diſpoſed all things: The other Lord; it being fit that the Creature ſhould be governed by its Maker.* And that *being thus attended with theſe Powers,* παρέχει τῇ ὁρατικῇ διανοίᾳ, τότε μὲν ἑνὸς, τότε δὲ τῶν τριῶν φαντασίαν, i. e. *He exhibits to the diſcerning Mind ſome time the Repreſentation of one, ſome times of three.*

Philo *de Abrahamo,* p. 287.

I think fit, that the Reader may make the better Judgment, to tranſcribe that whole Paſſage out of *Philo.* I ſhall premiſe that he is diſcourſing in that Place of *Abraham*'s entertaining the three Perſons mentioned, *Gen.* 18. who came to him

him in the *Heat of the Day*, which he, following the LXXII, underſtands of the *Noon*, or *Mid-day*. His words are theſe; Ἐωειδὰν οὖν ψυχὴ καθάπερ ἐν μεσημβρίᾳ τῷ φωτὶ λαμφθῇ, καὶ ὅλη δι' ὅλων τοῦ φωτὸς ἀναπλησθῇ τοῖς ἐν κύκλῳ κειμένοις αὐγαῖς ἄσκιον γίνηται, τελείαν φαντασίαν ἑαυτῆς ὑποκειμένην καταλαμβάνει τὸ μὲν ὡς ὄντος, τῶν δ' ἄλλων ὄντων, ὡς ἂν ἀπαυγαζομένων ἀπὸ τούτου σκιῶν, ὁποῖόν τι συμβαίνει καὶ τοῖς ἐν αἰθέρι φωτὶ διατρίβουσιν· ἢ γὰρ ἑκάστων ἢ κινουμένων διῆται σκιαὶ πολλάκις συμπίπτουσι· μὴ μοί τις νομιζέτω τὸν θεὸν τὰς σκιὰς λογεῖσθαι· καταχρηστικὸν ὄνομα αὐτὸ μόνον ἐξ ὁρμὴς ἐναργεστέρας ἐμφάσεως τῶν δηλουμένων πραγμάτων· ἐπεὶ τήγε ἀληθὲς οὐχ οὕτως ἔχει· ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὡς ἄν τις τῆς ἀληθείας ἐγγύτατα ἱστάμενος εἴποι, πατὴρ μὲν τῶν ὅλων ὁ μέσος, ὃς ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς γραφαῖς κυρίῳ ὀνόματι καλεῖται ὁ ὢν· αἱ δὲ παρ' ἑκάτερα πρεσβύταται καὶ ἐγγύταται τοῦ ὄντος δυνάμεις· ὧν ἡ μὲν ποιητική, ἡ δὲ βασιλικὴ προσαγορεύεται· καὶ ἡ μὲν ποιητικὴ θεός· ταύτῃ γὰρ ἔθηκέ τι καὶ διεκόσμησε τὸ πᾶν· ἡ δὲ βασιλικὴ κύριος· θέμις γὰρ ἄρχειν καὶ κρατεῖν τὸ ποιητικὸς τοῦ γεγονότος· διαφορούμενος οὖν ὁ μέσος ὑφ' ἑκατέρας τῶν δυνάμεων παρέχει τῇ ὁρατικῇ διανοίᾳ, τοτὲ μὲν ἑνὸς, τοτὲ δὲ τριῶν φαντασίαν· ἑνὸς μέν, ὅταν ἄκρως καθαρθεῖσα ἡ ψυχὴ, καὶ μὴ μόνον τὸ πλήθος τῶν αἰσθητῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ τῶν γειτνιασμάτων ὅρια διαβᾶσα ὑπερβάσα, πρὸς τὸν ἀμιγῆ καὶ

ἀσύν-

ὀσύμπλοκον καὶ καθ' αὑτὴν οὐδενὸς ἐπιδεᾶτο πρόσαπαν ἰδέαν ἐπείγηται· τριῶν δὲ, ὅταν μήπω τὰς μεγάλας τελεσθεῖσα τελετὰς, ἔτι ἐν τῇ βραχυτέραις ὀργιάζηται καὶ μὴ δύνηται τὸ ὂν ἄνευ ἑτέρου τινὸς εἰς αὐτοῦ μόνου καταλαβεῖν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῶν δρωμένων, ἢ κτίζον ἢ ἄρχον. That is, *When therefore the Soul, as at Noon day, is enlightened by God, and is intirely filled with intelligible Light, being surrounded with the Beams of it, then it becomes without any Shadow, it receives a three-fold Image of one Subject: Of one as of a Being, of the other two as of Shadows enlightened from that Being, as it happens to them that continue in a sensible Light; to whom often two Shadows happen, whether they stand or move. But let no Man think that Shadows can properly be attributed to God. This is Catachrestically to be understood, in order to the better and more clear apprehending this Matter; The truth of the thing being otherwise. But to come as near to the truth as may be, the Father of all things is the Middle, who in the Holy Scriptures is properly called* Ὁ ὢν, i.e. *He who IS. But then he who IS, is on each side attended by his most ancient and nearest Powers, of which one is* Creative, *the other* Kingly. *The* Creative *is God, by which he founded and adorned the* Universe. *The* Kingly *is Lord. It is fit that the Creature should be governed by its Maker.*

Maker. He that is in the Middle, being thus attended by both his Powers, does exhibit to the discerning Mind sometime the Representation of one, sometime of three: Of ONE, when the Soul being throughly purified, and not only having got beyond a Multitude of Numbers, but also the Dual *that stands next to the* Unite, *is carried on to the simple and unmingled* Idea *that wants nothing; of THREE when the Soul not being initiated into the greater Mysteries, but detained under the lesser, is not able to comprehend Him WHO IS, without some other, either his Acts of Creation or Government.*

The same Author, in the very next Page, pursues the same Argument, and farther explains himself. I will lay before the Reader the Substance of what he says upon this Occasion. He says there are three Orders of Men, and they distinguished according to their several Apprehensions of the Divine Being. The best of the Three are such as apprehend the Divinity under the Representation of HIM WHO IS. The Second are such as apprehend τὴν ἀνεργέτιν, ἢ θεὸς ὄνομα, i. e. The *Creative* or *Beneficent* Power, which is called God; the Third the *Kingly* or *Governing* Power, which is called *Lord*. The first Rank he reckons the best, but

does not exclude thoſe who are known to the Father by thoſe *Powers*. He explains himſelf thus. Men are ſhy of thoſe who Court their Friendſhip for *By* Ends: But God admits all Men who worſhip him. But then he will beſtow the *prime* Rewards on them that worſhip him for his own ſake; but then in the next place he will reward them that worſhip him for the ſake of ſome other *good* things, or the avoiding of ſome *Evils*, i. e. that worſhip him as a *Benefactor*, or a *King*; for they all agree in a good Work, *viz.* the Worſhip of God. That there is a three-fold Repreſentation of one Subject, is plain, not only from the *Allegorical* but *Literal* Senſe. For when *Abraham* deſired the three Perſons to receive his Hoſpitality, he does not addreſs to them as *THREE*, but as to *ONE*, ſaying, *My Lord, if I have found Favour in thy ſight, paſs not away.* And he treats them afterwards as *ONE*.

I cannot but make ſome Reflection upon this Noble Teſtimony of *Philo*, before I proceed any farther. It comes up to the purpoſe for which it is produced, *viz.* It ſhews that there was among the *Jews* a Belief of ſome kind of Plurality in God, and that Plurality exceeded not the Number of three; and farther ſtill, that the two *POWERS* which attended upon the

the Ὁ ὢν were not *Creatures*, or *Attributes* only, but Divine *Persons*. And tho' this last cited Passage of *Philo* do alone bid fair for the Proof of all this, yet I shall not only reflect on this Passage, but shall confirm this from other Places of the same Writer.

First, I will reflect upon the last cited Passage of *Philo*. And here I observe a Plurality in the Divine Nature observed by *Philo*. It is certain that he was no *Polytheist*. He sufficiently declares his Belief of one God on all Occasions; he does it particularly in a Place where he takes notice at the same time of some kind of Plurality in the Divine Nature: As on those words, *Gen.* 1. 26. *Let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeness*; where, says he, *Let us make*, does declare πλῆθος, a Plurality. He observes the like on *Gen.* 3 22. *Behold the Man is become like one of us.* His words on these last words are these, τὸ γὰρ ὡς εἷς ἡμῶν, οὐκ ἐφ' ἑνὸς, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πλειόνων τίθεται: That is, *those words, as one of us*, are not put for ONE, but for more than ONE. Soon after these words he adds, Ἔστιν εἷς ἄρχων, καὶ βασιλεὺς ᾧ πρυτανεύειν καὶ διοικεῖν μόνῳ θέμις τὰ σύμπαντα· τὸ γὰρ, Οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη, εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω. Εἷς βασιλεὺς, οὐκ ἐπὶ πόλεων καὶ ἀνθρώπων λεγοιτ' ἂν ἐνδίκῳ μᾶλλον, ἢ ἐπὶ

Philo *de confus. ling.* p. 270. *A.*

κόσμου καὶ θεοῦ· ἑνὸς γὰρ ἕνα ποιητὴν τε καὶ πατέρα πάλιν, καὶ δεσπότην ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι. i.e *God is the one Governour, Prince, King, by whom alone it is fit that all things should be administred and disposed of. For what is commonly said, that the Government of many is not good, and there must be one Head, one King, does not more belong to Cities and People, than to the World and God. That it is necessary there should be* ONE *Maker, and Father, and Governour of the One World.*

Philo sufficiently clears himself in these words from any just Imputation of *Polytheism:* And yet does he believe some Plurality, and indeed a Trinity. He mentions the Ὁ ὤν, i.e. *He who IS*, and whom he calls the FATHER of All things (of whose Divinity there is no dispute.) But then he mentions his TWO POWERS: One which is called (he says) *GOD*, the other *LORD:* One making the World, the other Governing it; and therefore they cannot be Creatures, but Divine Persons.

I shall next consider some other Places of *Philo* to the same Purpose. For what he delivers concerning this Matter, he repeats upon all Occasions, as that which was his constant and settled Judgment in the Case. I will not name all the Places that

that I could; it shall suffice that I produce some of them: and that with this Intention, that the Reader may see that this was the constant Doctrine of this *Jew*. I will lay his own words before the Reader, and they are these: Ἢ οὐκ ὁρᾷς ὅτι περὶ τὸ ὂν αἱ πρῶται καὶ μέγεσται τῶν δυνάμεών εἰσιν, ἥτε εὐεργέτις καὶ κολαστήριος; καὶ προσαγορεύεται, ἡ μὲν εὐεργέτις θεός, ἐπειδὴ κατὰ ταύτην ἔθηκε καὶ διεκόσμησε τὸ πᾶν· ἡ δευτέρα κύριος, καθ' ἣν ἀνῆπται τῶν ὅλων τὸ κράτος; θεὸς οὐκ ἀνθρώπων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ θεῶν ἐστὶ θεός, μέγας τέ ἐστιν, ὢν ὄντως, καὶ ἰσχυρός, καὶ κραταιός. i. e. *Doest thou not see that about Him who IS, are his first and greatest Powers, his Beneficent and his Punishing? The Beneficent is called GOD; for according to this he founded and adorned the UNIVERSE: The other is called LORD, to whom belongs the GOVERNMENT of all things. GOD is not the God of Men only, but of GODS. He who TRULY IS, is Great and Strong, and Mighty.* Elsewhere the same Author making mention of Κύριος, ὁ θεὸς αἰώνιος, That is, the *LORD, the ETERNAL GOD*, he immediately adds these words; Αἱ τοίνυν λεκθεῖσαι προσρήσεις τὰς περὶ τὸ ὂν ἐμφαίνουσι δυνάμεις· ἡ μὲν γὰρ κύριος, καθ' ἣν ἄρχει, ἡ δὲ θεὸς, καθ' ἣν εὐεργετεῖ. That is, *These words*, (*i. e.* The Lord the Eternal God) *declare the*

Philo *de vict. offer.* p.661. B.C.

Philo *de plantat. Noe.* p.176.

POWERS which are about Him who IS: the one of them is the LORD, by which he governs; the other is GOD, by which he is beneficent.

The ſame *Philo* mentioning *Gen.* 18. 6. where *Abraham* commands *Sarah* to make ready three Meaſures of fine Meal, and to make Cakes for the Entertainment of his three Strangers, adds theſe words;

Philo de Sacrif. Abel & Caini, p. 168. B.

Ἡνίκα ὁ θεὸς διερφορύμβ. ὑπὸ δυεῖν τῶν ἀνωτάτω δυνάμεων, ἀρχῆς τε αὖ καὶ ἀγαθότητ. ⊖., εἰς ὧν ὁ μὲν ⊖. τριτὰς φαντασίας ἐπεφαλάζετο τῇ ὁρατικῇ ψυχῇ, ὧν ἑκάστη μεμέτρηλαι μβ ὑδαμῶς· ἀπερίγραφοι γὰρ καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις αὐτῶ· μεμέτρηκε δ τὰ ὅλα· ἡ μὲν οὖν ἀγαθότης αὐτῶ μέτρον ἀγαθῶν ἔζιν· ἡ δ ἐξουσία μέτρον ἀτηκόων· ὁ δ ἡγεμὼν αὐτὸς ἀπαθῶν καὶ σωμάτων καὶ ἀσωμάτων· διὸ καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις καιόνων καὶ ἀδιαλλάκτων λαβοῦσαι λόγον, τὰ μὲν πάντας ἐσαθμίσαντο· τὸ μὲν ὂν τρία μέτρα παῦτα καλὸν ἐν ψυχῇ ὥσπερ φυραθῆναι τε καὶ σωσπεγχθῆναι, ἵνα πειθαρχῆται τ ἀνωτάτω εἰ) θεὸν ος ὑποκέκυφε πὸς δυνάμεις αὐτῆ, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτῆ ὁρώμβ. καὶ ὃν πάντας ἐμφανόμβ., δίχα ἀλλαγὰς ἐξουσίας τὸ καὶ διαγνώσεως αὐτῆ, καὶ τῶ πλείονα μέζιν ἡγουμβίν πλεονῶ, μιδενὶ περιχείρακ ὀκλαλῆ πὸ θεῖα μυζήρια, παμβυσμβίν δ' αὐτὸ καὶ ἐχεμυθοῦσα ὸν ἀπορρήτω φυλάτλῃ· ἡγεμονῆται γὰ ἐγκρυφίας ποιεῖν, ὅτι κεκρύφθαι δεῖ τ ἱερὸν τῶ ἀγλω-

ἀγλυνήτου καὶ τῶν δυνάμεων αὐτοῦ μύστην λόγον· ἐπεὶ θείων παρακαταθήκην ὀργίων οὐ παντὸς ἐστι φυλάξαι, i. e. *When God is attended with his Two Supreme Powers, Government and Goodness, being ONE in the Middle, he exhibits to the discerning Soul a three-fold* Idea, *each of which are not to be measured; for his Powers are not to be circumscribed. He gives measure to all things. His GOODNESS is the Measure of GOOD THINGS; His POWER of things Subject; but he himself is Governour of all things Corporeal and Incorporeal. Therefore these Powers, sustaining the Notion of Rules and Precepts, set a Weight on other things. It is good that these three Measures should, as it were, be fermented and mingled in the Soul, that being perswaded that there is a Supreme God, Eminent over his Powers, seen without them, and appearing in them, it may receive the Characters of his Power and Goodness; and being initiated into the Holy Mysteries, it may not easily discover them, but silently keep them hidden. It is written, and make* Cakes; *because it is fit that the Mystical account of him, who is unbegotten, and of his Powers, should be hidden; for every one is not fit to be a keeper of these Divine Mysteries.*

* Ἐγκρυφίας is the word used by the Lxxii, and by *Philo*; which we render *Cakes in the hearth*, viz. Such Cakes as are hidden with Embers.

In another Place the same *Philo* puts his Reader upon approving himself to the

Philo, *quod Deus sit immutabilis*, p. 242. *L.*

Supreme Being, laying aside all lower Familiarities: But then he adds these following words; Ἐὰν δ' ἄρα ἀδυνατῇς· ὑπερβάλλον γὰρ τὸ τοῦ ἀξιώματος μέγεθος· ἴσθι ἀμεταστρεπτὶ πρὸς τὰς δυνάμεις καὶ τούτων ἱκέτις γενοῦ, μέχρις ἂν ἀποδεξάμεναι τὸ συνεχὲς καὶ γνήσιον τῆς θεραπείας ἐν τῇ τῶν εὐαρεστησάντων αὐταῖς καταστάξωσι χώρᾳ, καθάπερ καὶ τὸν Νῶε. οὗ τῶν ἔργων θαυμαστότατον καὶ καινότατον πεποίηται τὸ κατάλογον· φησὶ γὰρ, Αὗται αἱ γενέσεις Νῶε· Νῶε ἄνθρωπος δίκαιος, τέλειος ὢν ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ αὐτοῦ, τῷ θεῷ εὐηρέστησε Νῶε. That is, *But if thou art not able* (*viz.* to arise to this highest pitch of perfection) *for this is a very high flight, forthwith apply thy self to his Powers, and be a Supplicant to them, that being prevailed on by thy constant and sincere Worship, thou mayest be received into the Order or Rank of them that walk with or please God; as it was with* Noah, *of whose Works the Scripture gives us this Marvellous Account, that he was righteous and perfect in his Generation, and that he pleased God.*

I might add more to these places which I have produced; but these are sufficient to my purpose. These Powers are ranked with him *WHO IS*; are said to have made and to govern the World; to be *GOD* and *LORD*; to be ἀπερίγραφοι, that is,

is, not to be circumscribed, as well as *HE WHO IS*; we are directed to pray to them, and worship them; they are distinguished from the *Father*; and *Philo*, who says all this, must believe them to be Divine Persons, and so must every Man do that believes him.

I shall now proceed to consider what *Philo* says of the λόγος or Word, and the Son of God; which are the Titles which the Sacred Writers of the New Testament bestow upon the *Messias*, and apply to *Jesus*: In which we shall plainly see how conformably he speaks to the Style of our Holy Writers.

Philo speaking of the *Manna*, which the *Israelites* did eat in the Wilderness, hath these words: Καλεῖται γὰρ τοῦ μάννα τι, or as it ought to be read (as appears from a parallel Place; *Leg. Allegor. Lib.* 2.) Καλεῖται γὰρ τοι μάννα τι ὃ πάντων ἐστὶ γένος· τὸ δὲ γενικώτατόν ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς καὶ δεύτερος ὁ θεοῦ λόγος, i. e. *The Manna is called* τι, *which is the* Genus *of all things. But that which is most general is God; and the second is the* λόγος, *or Word of God.* For the Explication of which it is to be remembred, that when the People of *Israel* first saw the *Manna*, they were surprised, not knowing what it was: They said, as the LXXII have it, *Exod.* 16.15. τί ἐστι τοῦτο;

Leg. Allegor. l. 3.

τοῦτο; i. e. *What is this?* The Text ſays that *they wiſt not what it was.* This Tranſlation *Philo* follows, as appears from another of his Books. And it being a thing ſtrange to them, and which they did not explicitly underſtand, he calls it πάντων γένος, the *Genus* of all things, whoſe particular Name and Nature they did not comprehend. Such (ſays he) is God; and the *ſecond*, the λόγος, or *Word* of *God*. We are to know that *Philo* makes the *Manna* to be a Symbol of the Divine λόγος, or *Word*, the Food and Nouriſhment of our immortal Souls. He tells us that this λόγος is the Bread which God gives us to eat, and is above all the World, more ancient and general than all the Creatures. To this purpoſe he applies *Deut.* 8. 3. *Man doth not live by Bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the Mouth of God.* He affirms that στόμα, or *Mouth*, in thoſe words is σύμβολον τοῦ λόγου, *i. e.* A Symbol of this λόγος, or Word of God. To the ſame purpoſe does *Philo* diſcourſe elſewhere. He tells us that the *Iſraelites* upon their firſt finding of *Manna*, did not indeed underſtand what it was; but that being inſtructed they found that it was θεῖος λόγος, *i. e.* the *Divine Word*, which was the ἀραιτος τροφή, or *Heavenly Food*, which,

Allegor. l. 2.

Ibid.

Philo de profugis.

as

as he ſays afterwards, affords *Light* and *Sweetneſs* to the Soul. He elſewhere calls *Manna* the *Divine Word*, and the Heavenly and Immortal Food of the Soul. The Reader will eaſily diſcern how conformable theſe words of *Philo* are to the words of the Goſpel of St. *John*. Our *Jeſus*, who is called the λόγος, or Word, *John* 1. ſpeaks very agreeable to this Notion of *Philo* concerning the *Manna*, which the *Iſraelites* found, and did eat in the Wilderneſs. He commands the *Jews*, who followed him for the Loaves, in theſe words, *Labour not for the Meat which periſheth, but for that Meat which endureth unto everlaſting Life, which the Son of Man ſhall give unto you*, John 6. 27. Upon this the *Jews* enquire of him farther, what they ſhould do, and what ſign he would ſhew them; and add, *Our Fathers did eat* Manna *in the Deſert, as it is written, He gave them Bread from Heaven to eat*, Verſ. 31. Then *ſaid Jeſus unto them, Verily, verily, I ſay unto you*, Moſes *gave you not that Bread from Heaven, but my Father giveth you that true Bread from Heaven. For the Bread of God is he which cometh down from Heaven, and giveth Life unto the World.* Upon this the *Jews* ſaid, *evermore give us this Bread. And* Jeſus *ſaid unto them I am the Bread of*

Philo, Quis rer. Divin. hæres.

of Life. He that cometh to me ſhall never hunger, and he that believeth on me ſhall never thirſt: Verſ. 31, 32, 33, 34, 35. Upon theſe words the *Jews* murmured at him: But *Jeſus* repeats the ſame words again, *I am that Bread of Life; your Fathers did eat* Manna *in the Wilderneſs, and are dead: This is the Bread which cometh down from Heaven, that a Man may eat thereof and not die; I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven,* Verſ. 48, 49, 50, 51.

It is farther obſervable that our Saviour, who, was the Anti-type of the *Manna*, met with ſuch an Entertainment from the *Jews*, as the *Manna* is obſerved by *Philo* to have met with from the *Iſraelites*. When the *Iſraelites* firſt ſaw the *Manna*, they ſaid τί τοῦτο; *i. e.* what is this? The Text tells us they *wiſt not what it was*: And after that, they deſpiſed and loathed it. This was what *Jeſus* met with alſo. *His own* knew him not, and rejected him. *We know* (ſay they) that *God ſpake by Moſes*: As *for this Fellow we know not whence he is*, John 9. 29.

I add that what *Philo* ſays concerning the *Manna* is very agreeable, not only to what we read in the New Teſtament, as hath in ſome Meaſure been obſerved before, but to what the other *Jewiſh* Writers ſay concerning it. If he make it a Sym-

Symbol, and put a Spiritual meaning upon it, ſo do they alſo. *Know* (ſays a *Jewiſh* Author) *that there is in the* Manna, סוד גדול, i. e. *a great Myſtery.* This was a Bread from Heaven, and the Food of Angels. The Light is ſweet ſays *Solomon*; This *Manna* (ſay the *Jews*) *is of the Cognation of Light, and this Light is from above, and was incorporated by the Will of the Bleſſed Creator:* So that they who eat *Manna* were *nouriſhed with the ſame Food with Angels*, viz. *the Splendor of the* Shechinah. *Of this* Manna (they ſay) the *Juſt ſhall eat in the World to come.* God gave *Manna* (ſays *R. Bechai*) *to them who received the Law to purifie their Minds, and to prepare them for the Knowledge of the Bleſſed God.* The Author of the Book of *Wiſdom* calls *Manna Angel's Food, and Bread prepared from Heaven without* Man's *Labour*; *able to content every Man's Delight, and agreeing to every Taſt.* —— And a while after he adds, *That thy Children, O Lord, which thou loveſt might know that it is not the growing of Fruits that nouriſheth Man, but that it is thy WORD*, &c. *Wiſdom* ch. 16. verſ. 20. 26. Theſe will juſtifie the *Chriſtian* Writers to all Intents and Purpoſes. If the *Jew* call it *the Heavenly Food*, and the *Food* of the *Soul*, no wonder that

R. M. Markants in Leg fol 34. col. 2. & 4.

R. Bechai in Leg fol. 88. col. 4.

R. Bechai in Exod.

St.

St. *Paul* should call it *Spiritual Meat*, 1 Cor. 10. 3. If it were the Bread of Angels, or that Glory which they partake of in Heaven, no wonder that St *John* should express the Heavenly Reward by eating of *Hidden Manna*, Apoc. 2. 17. If the *Jews* say that it was the Heavenly Splendor incorporated, nothing can be a fitter Type of the λόγος, that was made Flesh. If the *Jews* make it a Symbol of the Divine *Word*, no wonder that *Jesus* (who professed himself to be that *Word*) should apply it to himself. *John* 6. If according to the *Jews*, the Just were to eat of this *Manna* in the World to come, it cannot seem strange that *Christians* should express the Spiritual Blessings of the Days of *Messias*, and the Bliss of a future State, after the same Manner. And if *Philo* affirm the *Rock in the Wilderness* to be Synonymous to the *Manna*, which he styles τὸν πρεσβύτατον τῶν ὄντων λόγον θεῖον, i. e. *Of Beings the most Ancient, Divine Word*, we need not wonder that St. *Paul* should say of the *Israelites*, that they did all drink the same Spiritual Drink: *For they drank of that Spiritual Rock that followed them; and that Rock was Christ*, 2 Cor. 10. 4.

Philo *pag.* 137. C. *Kabbala Denudat. Tom.* 2. Pag. 393.

The same Author tells us that this Divine λόγος is the Governour of this lower World, that he is ὁ πηδαλιοῦχος καὶ Κυβερνή-

Lib. 2. *Alleg.* pag. 88. B.

της

τῆς τῶν παντός: He sits at the Helm and disposeth of all things. This he lays down as a Principle which ought to quiet our Minds under all Contingencies or Events. And elsewhere, more particularly, he tells us, That God, *As a King, and as a Shepherd, does according to Right and Law govern the Creatures as a Flock; the Earth and Water, the Air and Fire, all Plants and living Creatures, perishing things, and things more Divine, the Nature of the Heaven, the Periods of the Sun and Moon, the Motions of the Stars and their Harmonious Dances;* Προστησάμενος τὸν ὀρθὸν αὐτοῦ λόγον πρωτόγονον υἱόν, &c. *Setling over them the right Word, the first begotten Son, who takes upon him the Care of this holy Flock, as the Vicegerent of this great King, as 'tis written* (Exod. 23. 23.) *I will send mine Angel before thee,* &c. And then he goes on, *Now* (says he) *let all the World say, that great and most perfect Flock of the true God, the Lord is my Shepherd and I shall want nothing.* He goes on to stir up the particular Creatures after the most hearty Manner, to praise God upon this Account, as being now secure that they shall want nothing that is needfull for them ὀπιστατοῦντος θεοῦ, i.e. *God now presiding over* them, who will not fail to supply the Necessities of his Creatures. I will set down the words

Philo *de Agricultur.* p. 152. B.

words of the Author, Καθάπερ γὰρ τινα ποιμνίου, γλῶ καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ ἀέρα καὶ πῦρ, καὶ ὅσα ἐν τούτοις φυτά τι καὶ ζῶα, τὰ μὲ θνητά, τὰ δ' θεῖα· ἓτα δ' ἀέριον φύσιν, καὶ ἥλιν καὶ σελήνης ἕξοδόν τε, καὶ τὴν ἄλλον ἀστέρων τροπάς τε καὶ χορείαν ἐναρμονίους, ὡς ποιμνίου καὶ βασιλεὺς ὁ Θεὸς ἄγει κατ' ὀρθὸν καὶ νόμιμον, πανσοφίᾳ. τὸ ὀρθὸν αὐτὸς λόγον πρωτόγονον υἱὸν, ὃς τῶν ὅλων ἐπιμέλειαν τῆς ἱερᾶς ταύτης ἀγέλης, οἷα ποιμένων βασιλέως ὕπαρχον. Ἀφαιδέξεται· καὶ γὰρ εἴρηται τῳ· Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ εἰμι, ἀποστελῶ ἄγγελόν μου εἰς πρόσωπόν σου τοῦ φυλάξαι σε ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ· λεγέτω τοίνυν καὶ ὁ κύριος ἅπας, ὁ μεγίστη καὶ τελεωτάτη τοῦ ὄντος. Θεὸς ποιμήν, Κύριος ποιμαίνει με, καὶ οὐδέν με ὑστερήσει· λεγέτω ἡμᾶς. τὸν δὲ μέρει τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο, μὴ τῇ Ἀβραὰμ γλώττῃ καὶ χρηματος. φέρουσι φωνῇ, πρὸς βαρβάρων αἴρος. ἐξικνυμένῃ μιᾶς ἕκαστον, ἀλλὰ τῇ τῶν Ἀβραὰμίδων διρυωμένῃ, καὶ τὸν τοῦ παντὸς ἀποτομίαν πράτων· ἀμήχανον γὰρ τὸν ὑπερβαλλόντων ἐνθεαν εἶναί τινος, ἐπιστοιοῦντος. Θεοῦ πλήρη καὶ τέλεια παράδειγμα τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἅπασιν εἰωθότος. χαρίζεσθαι.

Thus like a *Chriſtian* does this great Man deliver himſelf. Any Man may ſoon diſcern that he ſpeaks what is very conformable to what is ſaid in the New Teſtament; where we ſhall find the ſame Doctrine delivered, and the ſame Power and Dominion attributed to the *Meſſias*, and claimed by *Jeſus*, which *Philo* owns

to

to belong to the λόγος. *All things* (says *Jesus*) *are delivered unto me of the Father*, Matth. 11. 27. *All Power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth*, Ch. 28. 18. *The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his Hand*, John 3. 35. *And hath given him Authority to execute Judgment also:* Chap. 5. 27. He is said, *to uphold all things by the Word of his Power.* Heb. 1. 2. φέρων, which we render *upholding*, signifies *Governing* or *Ruling*, in that place; as the word נשא is observed to do, from which comes נשיא, which signifies a *Prince*. Our Saviour is called ἄρχων, a *Prince of the Kings of the Earth*, Apoc. 1. vers. 5.

We see he calls the λόγος the Son of God, and his First-begotten Son. It will be fit here, for the farther clearing of this whole Matter, to shew that *Philo* believed that this Son of God was begotten from Eternity, as we *Christians* do believe and teach. I will lay his words before the Reader: His words are these, Κἂν μηδέπω μέντοι τυγχάνῃ τὶς ἀξιόχρεως ὢν υἱὸς θεοῦ προσαγορεύεσθαι, σπούδαζε κοσμεῖσθαι κατὰ τὸν πρωτόγονον αὐτοῦ λόγον, τὸν ἄγγελον πρεσβύτατον, ὡς ἀρχάγγελον πολυώνυμον ὑπάρχοντα· καὶ γὰρ ἀρχὴ, καὶ ὄνομα θεοῦ, καὶ λόγος, καὶ ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ὁρῶν Ἰσραὴλ προσαγορεύεται· διὸ προήχθην ὀλίγῳ πρότερον

Philo *de Confus. linguar.* pag. 267.

τερον ἐπαινέσαι τὰς ἀρχὰς τῶν φασκόντων ὅτι πάντες ἐσμὲν υἱοὶ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου· καὶ γὰρ εἰ μήπω ἱκανοὶ θεοῦ παῖδες νομίζεσθαι γεγόναμεν, ἀλλά τοι τῆς ἀϊδίου εἰκόνος αὐτοῦ λόγου τοῦ ἱερωτάτου θεοῦ γὰρ εἰκὼν, λόγος ὁ πρεσβύτατος. That is, *If it be so that as yet a Man may not be worthy to be called the Son of God, however do thy endeavour to be adorned like unto his First-begotten Word, the most Ancient Angel, and Archangel, that hath several Appellations or Names*, viz. *The beginning, the Name of God, the Word, and the Man according to his Image, and the seeing* Israel; *for thus is he called: And therefore I was induced a little before to commend those who mention their Original, saying, that we are all the Sons of one MAN. For if we are not fit to be esteemed the Children of GOD, yet we may be of him, who is His ETERNAL Image, and most Holy WORD. For the most Ancient WORD is the Image of God.* The same *Philo* (pag. 255, D.) in the same Book, speaking of the same Matter, hath these words, Ἐπεὶ καὶ πῶς οὐκ ἐμέλλετε, φήσαιμ' ἄν, ὦ γενναῖοι, πολέμῳ μὲν δυσχεραίνειν, εἰρήνην δὲ ἀγαπᾶν, ἵνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐπιγεγραμμένοι πατέρα οὐ θνητὸν, ἀλλ' ἀθάνατον, ἄνθρωπον θεοῦ, ὃς τοῦ ἀϊδίου λόγος ὢν ἐξ ἀνάγκης καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἄφθαρτος. *O Excellent Men, how can it be otherwise but that you should hate war and love*

love peace, when you do profeſs to have the ſame Father? and he not Mortal but Immortal, the Man of God, who being the WORD of the Eternal, is of NECESSITY himſelf alſo IMMORTAL.

Philo in theſe two Paſſages ſeems to refer to *Gen.* 42. v. 11. But that which I think of greateſt Moment, is what he affirms of the λόγος, whom he frequently calls the *Son of God*, and *God's Image*: And two things I cannot but obſerve, *viz.* (1) That he owns this Son of God to be his Eternal Image; and if ſo, he was not born or made in time; which is what we *Chriſtians* believe and teach. (2) That he affirms, that this λόγος is not only Immortal, but that he is of *NECESSITY*, or *NECESSARILY* ſo, which can be affirmed of no Creature whatſoever. For though we believe the Souls of Men to be *Immortal*, yet we cannot truly affirm of them that they are of *NECESSITY*, or *NECESSARILY* ſo. I ſhall in this place obſerve farther that *Philo* does affirm that *WISDOM* and the *WORD* of God are one and the ſame: Of which Confeſſion of his I may have an occaſion to make uſe afterwards. Philo *Leg. Allegor. l. 1. p. 39. a.*

The ſame Author in another place, ſpeaking of the ſeveral Rows of the pretious Stones upon *Aaron's* Breaſt, tells us

Philo *de vita Moſis*, l. 3. p. 521. that they were a Repreſentation Τῦ συνεχοῦς καὶ διοικοῦντος λόγυ τὸ σύμπαν, i. e. *Of the* λόγος *that upholdeth and governeth all things.* To which the Author adds, Ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ ἦν τὸν ἱερωμένον τῷ τῦ κόσμυ πατρὶ συγκλήτῳ χρῆσθαι πλειοπίτῳ τῷ ἀρετῶν υἱῷ, πρὸς τὴ ἀμνηστίαν ἁμαρτημάτων, καὶ χορηγίας ἀφθονωτάτων ἀγαθῶν. That is, *For it was neceſſary that the Prieſt of the Father of the Univerſe ſhould make uſe of the moſt perfect Advocate his SON, to procure an Amneſty of Sins, and a Supply of* Grace, *or good things.* I take the Subſtance of what he ſays laſt to be this: The High-Prieſt had upon his Breaſt a Breaſt-plate, which was called the λόγιον, or λογεῖον (as the LXXII render it, *Exod.* 28. 15.) ſeveral Rows of precious Stones; This was a Type of the Divine λόγος, or Word; and this therefore implied the Neceſſity of a more perfect Advocate with the Father than the *Jewiſh* High-Prieſt could be; *viz.* The Son of God himſelf, the great Anti-type of that Breaſt-plate, the θεῖος λόγος, or Divine Word. And, thanks be to God, ſuch an Advocate we have, 1 *John* 11. 1. *Heb.* 9. 24.

Philo *de conf. ling.* pag. 251. F. I cannot but in this place add another very remarkable Paſſage of the ſame Author; and I will do it in his own words. They are theſe; Ἐμπρεπὴς γὰρ τοῖς ἑπαιρίαν πρὸς

πρὸς ὑπεκμέλω θεμένοις, ἐφίεσθαι μὲ τῆτον ἰδεῖν· εἰ δὲ μὴ δύναιντο, τὴν γῆν εἰκόνα αὐτῆ, τὸ ἱερώτατον λόγον, μεθ' ὃν ἔχ τὸ ὂν αἰσθητοῖς τελειότατον ἔργον· τὸν δὲ τὸν κόσμον· τὸ γὰρ φιλοσοφεῖν ὐδὲν ἄλλο, ἢ ταῦτα σπουδάζειν ἀκριβῶς ἰδεῖν· τὸν δὲ αἰσθητὸν κόσμον ὡς ἂν τοιοῦτόν θεῖν φησὶν εἶναι διὰ τέτο· πρῶτον μὲν ἵνα ἐπιδείξῃ ὅτι ἐκ ὂν τῷ γενητῷ τὸ ποιητικὸς αἴτιον· ἔπειτα δὲ, ὅτι τῷ δεσπόζειν, ὅτι δὲ ὁ κόσμος ἅπας ἀφίτῳ καὶ ἀπελεύθερος ζώσῃ κινήσει κέχρηται. ἀλλ' ὑπεβίβασεν ὁ κυβερνήτης θεὸς τῷ ὅλων· εἰκότως δὲ ποδάλιον ἔχων σωτηρίως τὰ σύμπαντα, ὅτι πᾶσιν, ὅτι χερσὶν, ὅτι ἄλλῳ τῷ ὃν ἡδύσει κεχρημένῳ. μέρει τοιαύτην ὑδενὶ, καὶ τὸν ἀληθῆ λόγον.

That is, *It is very becoming the Friends of Knowledge that they ſhould be deſirous to ſee God:* (or, to contemplate the place of his *Reſidence, and the World his* Footſtool.) *If they cannot attain to that, yet at leaſt to contemplate his moſt Holy Word; and then the moſt perfect of ſenſible things, this World: For to philoſophize is nothing elſe but diligently to endeavour to contemplate theſe things. This ſenſible World is ſaid to be God's Footſtool for theſe Reaſons.* Firſt, *That it might appear that a Creature is not the Efficient Cauſe.* Secondly, *To make it appear that the World is not moved from it ſelf, but that God governs the whole, and ſavingly ſits at the Helm, not with Feet,*

or Hands, or other Members, but according to his true WORD. The use that I make of this Passage is to prove the Divinity of the λόγος against the *Jews*, from one of their most celebrated Writers. For if the λόγος made the WORLD, as this Author in many Places before named owns, then is he no Creature himself, as we find he affirms here.

The same Author in sundry other Places speaking of this λόγος, calls him *Divine*, stiles him the *Light*, the *High-Priest*, the *Image* of God, whom we ought to *imitate*: In which he speaks very conformably to the Style of the New Testament. *Heb.* 1. 3. & ch. 5. 5. *John* 1. v. 4, 5, 9. Sometimes he calls him the Archetypal Seal, the Arthetypal Paradigm, the Intellectual World, God, and the δέσμος τῶν ἁπάντων; the *Bond* or *Ligament* of the *UNIVERSE*.

P. 4. 5. 463. 465. 364.

When he speaks upon those words, *Lev.* 4. 3. *If the Priest that is anointed do sin, according to the Sin of the People*, He adds these words; Ὅτι ὁ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν Ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ μὴ ψευδώνυμος ἀμέτοχος ἁμαρτημάτων ἐστίν. That is, *The true High-Priest, and he who is not falsly so called, is free from Sins. Such an High-Priest became us*, who *is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from Sinners*, &c. And *who needs not to offer up Sacri-*

D. Vestimen. p. 652. &

Sacrifice for his own Sins, Heb. 7. 26, 27. He ſuppoſes the true High-Prieſt to be without Sin; and this agrees with the Character given him by the Author of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*. He ſpeaks in another Place to the ſame purpoſe; Λέγομεν γὰρ τὸν ἀρχιερέα οὐκ ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ λόγον θεῖον εἶναι, πάντων καὶ ἑκουσίων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκουσίων ἁμαρτημάτων ἀμέτοχον. That is, *We affirm that the High Prieſt is not a Man but the Divine Word; free from all Sins, both voluntary and involuntary.* *Philo* elſewhere mentioning thoſe words, *Zech.* 6. v. 12. *Behold the Man whoſe Name is the BRANCH*, hath a very remarkable Paſſage to my preſent purpoſe. I only premiſe that what is rendered *BRANCH*, is in the *Greek* Ἀνατολὴ; and ſo it is in *Philo*; and ſignifies as much as the Latin Word *Oriens*, and imports the Riſing of the Sun; but of it ſelf it ſignifies indefinitely any Riſing: A *Branch* riſeth, indeed, from the Stock of the Tree. But *Philo* (not to ſay others) underſtands the words in the former Senſe. His words are to this purpoſe. *This would be a new Sort of Appellation, if the words were to be underſtood of a Man conſiſting of Body and Soul. But if we underſtand it of that incorporeal Being, who bears the Image of God, that Appellation does fitly belong*

De profug. p. 364. B.

De confuſ. linguar. p. 258. A.

to him: For the Father of Beings was for the rising of this his most ancient Son, whom he otherwise calls his First-born: And he being born, imitating his Father's ways, he formed such Species as were agreeable to the Archetypal Exemplars of his Father's, which he had seen. But I shall chose to lay the words before the Reader as they are in the Author. The words are these; Καινοτάτη γὰρ πρόσρησις, ἐὰν μὲν γε τὸν ἐκ σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς συνεστῶτα λέγεσθαι νομίσῃς· ἐὰν δὲ τὸν ἀσώματον ἐκεῖνον θείας ἀρχαφορῶντα εἰκόνος, ὁμολογήσεις ὅτι εὐθυβολώτατον ὄνομα ἐπεφημίσθη τὸ ἀνατολῆς αὐτῷ· τοῦτον μὲν γὰρ πρεσβύτατον υἱὸν ὁ τῶν ὄντων ἀνέτειλε πατήρ, ὃν ἑτέρωθι πρωτόγονον ὠνόμασε, καὶ ὁ γεννηθεὶς μέντοι μιμούμενος τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς ὁδοὺς, πρὸς παραδείγματα ἀρχέτυπα ἐκείνου βλέπων, ἐμόρφου εἴδη. These words are quoted by *Eusebius*, who followed a truer Copy than what we now have: But that quotation agrees for the Substance with what we now read in *Philo*. What in *Philo* is now ἀρχαφορῶντα εἰκόνος is θείαν ἰδέαν φορῶντα in *Eusebius*, which is doubtless the truest reading of the place. The Reader may compare this with what is to be found, *John* 5. 19, 20.

Euseb. præpar. pag. 533.

Before I conclude this Head, I shall consider what *Philo* says concerning the Mediatorship and Intercession of this

λόγος,

λόγος, which is a particular that *Christians* are much concerned in: And we shall find that even here he speaks very conformably to the Style of the New Testament. He tells us that the λόγος, or Word, had this granted him by his Father that he should stand the μεθόριος, in *the Mids*, between God and his Creatures: That is, A supplicant Intercessor for Mortals with the Immortal, a *Legate* of the Ruler to his Subjects. That he is neither begotten as Mortals, nor unbegotten as God; That he interceeds with God that he will not destroy his Creature; and assures the Creature that God will not lay aside the Care of his own Work. This agrees with what we read, *Heb.* 8. 6. The Reader may take what he says in his own words. Τὸ δὲ ἀρχαγγέλῳ καὶ πρεσβυτάτῳ λόγῳ δωρεὰν ἐξαίρετον ἔδωκεν ὁ τὰ ὅλα γεννήσας πατὴρ, ἵνα μεθόριος στὰς, τὸ γενόμενον διακρίνῃ τοῦ πεποιηκότος· ὁ δ' αὐτὸς ἱκέτης μὲν ἐστι τοῦ θνητοῦ κηραίνοντος· ἀεὶ πρὸς ἄφθαρτον, πρεσβευτὴς δὲ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος πρὸς τὸ ὑπήκοον· ἀγάλλεται δὲ ὅτι τῇ δωρεᾷ, καὶ σεμνυνόμενος αὐτὴν ἐκδιηγεῖται φάσκων, κἀγὼ εἰστήκειν ἀνὰ μέσον κυρίου καὶ ὑμῶν, οὔτε ἀγένητος ὡς ὁ θεὸς ὤν, οὔτε γενητὸς ὡς ἡμεῖς, ἀλλὰ μέσος τῶν ἄκρων, ἀμφοτέροις ὁμουρεύων· παρὰ μὲν τῷ φυτεύσαντι, πρὸς πίστιν τοῦ μὴ σύμπαν ἀφανίσαι ποτὲ καὶ ἀποστῆναι τὸ γένος, ἀκοσμίαν ἀντὶ κόσμου ἑλόμενον·

P. 397 & 398.

μένον· παρὰ δὲ τῷ φύντι, πρὸς εὐελπιστίαν τοῦ μήποτε τὸν ἵλεων θεὸν παριδεῖν τὸ ἴδιον ἔργον.

To summ up at once what this Excellent Writer says to our present purpose, thus it is in short. He plainly enough insinuates the Holy Trinity under the Titles of him *WHO IS*, and his TWO POWERS. He gives a Representation of the Divine Nature under the Ideas of THREE and ONE. He gives to the TWO POWERS of HIM who *IS*, the Titles of GOD and LORD. To *One* He attributes the CREATION, to the *other* the GOVERNMENT of the UNIVERSE. He puts Men upon making Supplication to these POWERS, and affirms that they are no more circumscribed than HE WHO IS. And for the λόγος, he makes him to be the Anti-type of the *Manna*, or Bread from Heaven; and affirms that he is the Son of God, ETERNALLY begotten, and NECESSARILY IMMORTAL, The TRUE HIGH-PRIEST, the PRINCE of the UNIVERSE, the BRANCH, the IMAGE of GOD, the Intellectual World, the Archetypal *Seal* and *Paradigm*; and lastly, that he is the Advocate, and the MEDIATOR between God and Men: Not unbegotten as the Father is, nor yet begotten as Men are begotten. This is the

the Summ of the Evidence which is given us by *Philo* the *Jew*, whom *Amram* calls the Divine *Philo*.

Having ſhewn what Account *Philo* the *Jew* hath given of the λόγος or Word, I ſhall now proceed to conſider the *Chaldee* Paraphraſts, who are Authors of great Eſteem among the *Jews*.

I will begin with *Onkelos*, whom *Maimonides* greatly commends in ſeveral Places; and doubtleſs very juſtly. He is the moſt Ancient of them; and his *Chaldee* Style, which is very Terſe and Biblical, ſpeaks him ſo to be. *Maimonides* does juſtly commend him for his ſingular Care, in turning thoſe places very cautiouſly and wiſely which are ſpoken of God after the Manner of Men; and the Particulars which he produceth to this purpoſe are well worth the obſerving. But that is not my preſent purpoſe: I ſhall ſhew that the word which he uſes as anſwerable to the λόγος, he ſo uſeth, that it plainly appears that he repreſents by it a Divine Perſon, or God himſelf. I begin with *Gen.* 9. 12. *And God ſaid, this is the Token of the Covenant which I make between me and you. Between me and you,* is rendred by *Onkelos*, *Between my Word and you.* Again, Chap. 15. v. 1. God ſays to *Abram*, *I am thy Shield. Onkelos* renders

Maimon. more nevochim.

ders it, *my Word is thy Strength.* And *verſ.* 6. where it is ſaid, *He believed in the Lord. Onkelos* renders it, *He believed in the Word of the Lord.* Again, Chap. 17:2. *Between me and thee* is rendered by *Onkelos, Between my Word and thee.* And ſo 'tis by *Onkelos* rendered again, *verſ.* 7. I ſay, 'tis ſo rendered again by *Onkelos*, though the *Latin* Verſion of that *Paraphraſt* do take no notice of it. But the *Latin* Verſion is not to be relied upon; eſpecially in the firſt part of it. So it is rendered again, *verſ.*10. Lev.26.9. God ſays, *I will have reſpect* unto you; *Onkelos* renders it, *I will look upon you in my Word.*

The other *Paraphraſts* on the *Pentateuch* ſpeak agreeably to *Onkelos* in this Matter. I will give an Inſtance or two *Gen.*19.24. 'Tis ſaid, *The Lord rained upon Sodom.* But both *Jonathan* and the *Jeruſalem Targum* render it, *The Word of the Lord ſent Rain* &c. Again, *Levit.* 26. 12. God makes a promiſe to the *Iſraelites* upon their Obedience, and ſaith, *I will walk among you, and will be your God, and ye ſhall be my People.* Thus does *Jonathan* paraphraſe upon thoſe Words. *I will be your God,* ויהי מימרי לכון לאלהא פרוק, i. e. *and my Word ſhall be unto you God the Redeemer.* It will be worth our while to conſider

der this place, with its Context, with Care and farther Application. I obſerved before how *Onkelos* turns the words, *verſe* 9. *I will have reſpect unto you*, i. e. *I will look upon you in my Word.* It follows *v.* 11. *I will ſet my Tabernacle amongſt you, and my Soul ſhall not abhor you.* 'Tis very obſervable that *my Soul*, is turned by *Onkelos* מימרי *my Word*, which muſt be underſtood of the Eſſential and θεῖος λόγος, or *Divine Word.* This is manifeſtly the meaning of that *Paraphraſt:* And then thoſe words, *I will ſet my Tabernacle amongſt you*, is perfectly agreeable to what is related by St. *John* of the Eternal λόγος or Word; *The word was made Fleſh, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν*, i. e. *And he tabernacled among us*; and it follows, *and we beheld his Glory*, John 1. 14. This agrees exactly with what is promiſed *v.* 11. θήσω τὸ σκηνή μου ἐν ὑμῖν, as the LXXII have it. 'Tis very well known that σκηνὴ, *to Tabernacle*, hath a great Affinity as well in *ſenſe* as *ſound* to the *Hebrew* שכן, which ſignifies *to Tabernacle*; from whence comes the *Shechinah*, which ſignifies the Divine Preſence, Glory, or Majeſty. To which Senſe *Onkelos* turns the word in this place: from whence it is eaſie to ſee how agreeably St. *John* ſpeaks; who after he had told us that the Word was made Fleſh, Levit. 26.

and

and Tabernacled among us, adds, *and we beheld his Glory*. How agreeably theſe words, *we beheld his Glory*, follow, the *Jew* will eaſily ſee, if he will take the pains to compare what *Aben Ezra* hath ſaid on *Levit.* 26. 11. Several of the *Jews* allow of a farther Senſe of the words in *Leviticus* than what ariſeth from the firſt view of the Letter; and *Rabbi Solomon*, and the Author of the *Peſikta* expound the Covenant, *v.* 9. of the New Covenant, which the Prophet *Jeremy* (Ch. 31. v. 31.) foretells, and which the Author of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* (Chap. 8.) applies to the Evangelical Diſpenſation: But I need not enter into that Matter.

Again, *Iſaiah* ch. 48. *v.* 15. I, even *I have ſpoken*; The *Chaldee Paraphraſt* hath it, *I by my Word have made a Covenant with* Abraham *your Father*. Again, *v.* 13. *Mine hand hath laid the Foundation of the Earth*; the *Chaldee* hath it, *I have founded the Earth by my Word*. Again, *v.* 16. *Come ye near unto me*; the *Chaldee* thus, *Come near unto my Word*. Again, *Pſ.* 110. v. 1. *The Lord ſaid unto my Lord*. The *Chaldee Paraphraſt* hath it, *The Lord ſaid by his Word*.

But to return to *Onkelos:* he does in many places turn the word יהוה, which we render *Lord*, by מימרא דיי, *the Word of*

of the Lord. I ſhall name ſome of them, *Gen.* 28. 21. *Then ſhall the Lord be my God*; Onk. Then *ſhall the Word of the Lord*, &c. ch. 31. *v.* 49. *The Lord watch between me and thee.* Onk. *The Word of the Lord watch*, &c. *Exod.* 16. 8. *Your murmurings are not againſt us, but againſt the Lord*; Onk. Your murmurings are not againſt us, but againſt *the Word of the Lord*, Levit. 26. *v.* 46. *Between him and the Children of* Iſrael; Onk. *Between his Word*, &c. *Numb.* 11. v. 20. *Ye have deſpiſed the Lord.* Onk. Ye have deſpiſed the *Word of the Lord*, Deut. 20. 1. *The Lord thy God.* Onk. *The Word of the Lord thy God*, Deut. *ch.* 5. v. 5. *Between the Lord and you.* Onk. Between the *Word of the Lord*, &c. I ſhall afterward have occaſion to return to the place laſt quoted.

Conformable to *Onkelos* is the *Targum* of *Jeruſalem*; v. 9. *Gen.* 1. v. 27. *God created Man.* Targ. Hieroſ. *The Word of the Lord created* Man. Ch. 3. v. 9. *The Lord called.* T. H. *The Word of the Lord called.* V. 23. *The Lord God.* T. H. *The Word* of the Lord God. Ch. 30. v. 22. *God remembred.* T. H. *The Word of the Lord.* I forbear to quote more places: Theſe are ſufficient to my purpoſe; and if they were not, a greater Number would not ſuffice. By what hath been produced

ced it does appear abundantly that the *Chaldee Paraphraſts* ſpeak of the Word in the ſame manner that *Philo* does, and conformably to what we read in St. *John*.

Obj. I very well know that it hath been objected by an *Anti-Trinitarian*, that theſe Expreſſions are not to be underſtood of the *ſubſtantial* λόγος or Word, but of the Command or Speech of God or Man, which is in the *Hebrew* expreſſed by דבר, to which he ſuppoſeth the *Chaldee* מימרא to anſwer. This is indeed a plauſible Pretext and worth our Conſideration.

Anſw. 1. 'Tis very certain that theſe words of the *Paraphraſts* cannot be underſtood in the ſenſe pretended. Let any Man living that is in his ſound Mind go over the Places above-named, and he muſt confeſs that this can never conſiſt. Can any Man ſuppoſe this agreeable with what hath been obſerved before from *Gen.* 28. 21? or with the words, *ch.* 31. v. 41? No Man can deny but the *Targumiſts* had an higher meaning than this. I only deſire the Reader to reflect on the fore-cited Places, and he will not make any doubt of this Matter.

2. To

2. To pretend that מימרא, which is the word uſed by the *Targumiſts*, does anſwer to the *Hebr.* דבר, which ſignifies *Speech*, *Command* or *Decree*, is indeed ſomething, if any Shadow of *Proof* were produced. But here is no offer of any ſuch thing. 'Tis eaſie to *ſuppoſe* or to *affirm* any thing, to get looſe from the Preſſure of an Argument; but this is to trifle, and not to argue.

3. A Learned Man hath obſerved that the Suppoſition in the Objection is in Fact abſolutely falſe; *viz.* that the *Hebr.* דבר, which ſignifies a *Speech*, a *Commandment*, a *Decree* or *Order*, is turned by the *Chaldee* word מימרא, which is the word uſed by the *Targumiſts* in the places above-quoted. He affirms that this can never be proved from the Text. And we have reaſon to believe him, till we find any *Arrian* or *Socinian*, or any other Perſon whatſoever, produce any one Text to that Purpoſe. *Rittangel. in Jetzirá.*

4. It is very certain that the *Chaldees* had another word by which they turned the *Hebrew* word דבר, and that was the word מתנם or מתנמא. *Elias Levita*, who very well underſtood this Matter, makes that the *Chaldee* word into which the *Hebrew* דבר is turn'd, and produceth ſeveral inſtances to that Purpoſe: But he *Et Levit. Mathurg. in voce.* תנם

makes no mention of מימרא upon that occaſion; which he would not have failed (in all probability) to have done, had he been able to have done it. I ſhall here reflect upon a very remarkable place, which I had occaſion to mention before. It is *Deut.* 5. 5. *I ſtood between the Lord and you, at that time, to ſhew you the Word of the Lord.* The *Chaldee Paraphraſt* turns the words thus: *I ſtood between the Word of the Lord and you, at that time, to ſhew you the Word of the Lord.* In this Verſion *word* occurs twice, but in *different* Senſes: In the former Part of the Verſe it is put inſtead of *Lord*, and muſt ſignifie the *Eſſential* יהוה, and is accordingly expreſſed by מימרא; but in the *latter* Part of the Verſe it ſignifies *Commandment*, or the revealed Will of God, which דבר ſignifies; which is the word uſed in the *Hebrew* Text of the Place, and is by the *Chaldee Paraphraſt* expreſſed by the word פתגמא, which is the *Chaldee* word which anſwers to it.

From the particulars mentioned before, it evidently appears, that the Ancient *Jews* did by the *word* mean a *Divine Perſon:* And whoever will diligently conſider the Places above-mentioned (and many more might be produced) muſt needs confeſs it. My Author I named before

fore tells us, that he urged this Argument ſo cloſely upon his *Anti-trinitarian*, (who had skill in this ſort of Learning) that after all his Shifts and Evaſions, he was forced formally to declare, that if this were the Senſe of theſe words, *Actum eſt de nobis; veſtræ enim fidei firmiſſima propugnacula inde ſuppeditari videntur*, i.e. *That* their *Cauſe was loſt; for that there ſeem'd to ariſe from thence very ſtrong Arguments in Defence of* our *Belief*. *Rittangel. p. 112.*

The laſt named Author proceeds, and attempts to prove, from many Teſtimonies out of *Onkelos*, that the *Third Perſon*, or *Holy Spirit*, is very often expreſſed by שכינתא, or the *Divine Majeſty*. I ſhall not follow him in the Enumeration of theſe Places, nor lay a greater ſtreſs upon it than it will bear. Yet certain it is (as *Elias Levita* informs us) that the *Rabbins* did call the *Holy Spirit* שכינה. And to this Purpoſe they ſay that the *Shechinah* (*i. e.* the Divine Spirit) *does not reſt, but upon a Man that is valiant*, &c. He tells us elſewhere, that tho' ordinarily the Word שכן be rendred by another word, yet, when it is applied to the Bleſſed God, that the *Targumiſt* adds the word שכינתא, which ſignifies the *Majeſty* or *Divinity*. *Thisbi in* שכן

CHAP. VI.

The CONTENTS.

Some Objections *againſt what hath been ſaid before.* (1) *It is* objected *againſt* Philo *that he was a* Platoniſt, *and that he learned what he ſaid on this Argument from* Plato. *An Anſwer to this* Objection. *It does not appear that* Philo *learnt his Doctrine from* Plato. *That it is very credible that* Plato *received his Doctrine in theſe Matters from the* Jewiſh *Books, or* Jewiſh Kabbala. *Teſtimonies of many of the* Ancients *to this purpoſe. It will be hard to give any other Account of the Principles of* Plato. *That other* Jewiſh *Writers agree with* Philo. Objection (2) *That this is a Novel Doctrine. An Anſwer to this Objection. A very remarkable Paſſage out of* Theodorit *to this purpoſe. Some Reflections on that Paſſage. The* Heathens *had ſome knowledge of the* Trinity, *and* λόγος. *That they received many things from the* Jews. *The Original of ſeveral People beſt known from* Moſes. *Hence the Fables of the* Heathen *had their ground. The Story of* Saturn *was derived from that Account which* Moſes

Moses *gives of* Noah; *This appears from a great many Correspondences. A more particular Account of them: The Sons of* Saturn *in the* Heathen *Mythology the same with those of* Noah. Jupiter *answered to* Ham. *He was* Ammon: *Of* Amon-No. *Jerem.* 46. 25. *explained*; Neptune *the same with* Japhet. *The Congruity between the History of* Moses, *and the* Heathen *Mythology, considered.* Pluto *the same with* Shem. Plato *is observed to borrow from* Moses, *or the* Jewish Kabbala: *A clear proof of this from his* Convivium, *or the Speech of* Aristophanes; *Its conformity to the Text of* Moses, *and the* Jewish Kabbala. *What the Ancient* Heathen *have said concerning the* λόγος *and* Trinity. *Of the* Mithras τριπλάσιος *among the* Persians. *Some passages from the* Chaldee *Oracles*; *The Testimony of* Orpheus, *and* Epicharmus, *concerning the* λόγος. *Footsteps of the* Trinity *in the* Egyptian *Theology. Of* Plato's *Doctrine of the* Trinity. *The great usefulness of these Testimonies from the Heathens to our common* Christianity *shewed in sundry particulars.*

HAving given this Account of *Philo*, and the *Targumists*, I should next proceed to shew that the Doctrine of the

Trinity, as it was at firſt inſinuated by *Moſes*, and was a *Kabbala* among the *Jews*, ſo it was not altogether unknown to the wiſer part of the *Gentiles*.

But before I proceed to that Matter, I ſhall endeavour to remove ſome pretences againſt what hath been ſaid in the foregoing Chapter.

Except. 1. It is, or may be, excepted, that *Philo* was a *Platoniſt*, and that what he ſays in this Argument, being received from *Plato*, an *Heathen* Writer, can have no great weight in this Matter. I anſwer,

Anſw. 1. It does by no means appear that *Philo* ever borrowed from *Plato* what he hath ſaid before upon this occaſion. Let him that makes this Objection produce (if he can) any proof to this purpoſe out of any part of the Works of *Philo*. I muſt add on the other hand that he does all along fetch his proofs from the Law and the Prophets. We find that what he ſays of Him who *Is*, and of his two *Powers*, of the ONE and of the THREE, he fetcheth from the words of *Moſes*. What he affirms of the λόγος, he draws from the Text of the Old Teſtament, or from ſome Symbol and Type which he finds there. Thoſe Noble Teſtimonies of the

Advo-

Advocation and *Prieſthood* and *Mediatorſhip* of the Son of God, he takes from the Law and Prophets. He neither takes any thing out of *Plato*, nor does he ſo much as quote him by way of Confirmation of what he affirms. So that what is pretended in this Exception is altogether groundleſs and defenceleſs. This is indeed a common Exception made againſt *Philo*, to invalidate his Teſtimony; and we run away with it as very conſiderable: But after all, if we look for the grounds on which it is built, we may look long enough: For it hath no kind of Foundation to ſupport it.

2. On the other hand we have ſufficient Cauſe to believe that *Plato* might, and actually did receive what he writes of theſe Matters, from the *Jewiſh* Books. That *Plato* went into *Egypt*, is agreed on all hands. *Apuleius*, one of his Diſciples, and an *Heathen*, affirms that he went thither, *Ut inde Prophetarum ritus addiſceret*, That is, *That he might learn the Rites of the Prophets* (a): *Valerius Maximus*, another *Heathen* Writer, affirms that he went into *Egypt*, and learnt of the Prieſts (*b*). *Ariſtobulus* a *Jew* ſays, that *it is plain that* Plato *followed our Law, and that he diligently ſtudied the ſeveral parts of it* (c). *Joſephus* the *Jew* affirms

(a) *Apuleius de dogmate Platonis.*

(b) *V. Maximus* l. 8. c. 7.

(c) *Euſeb. Præpar.* l. 13. c. 12.

the ſame, Μάλιστα δ Πλάτων μεμίμηται τ ἡμέτερον νομοθέτην (d), That is, *That* Plato *did much imitate* Moſes. *Numenius* the *Pythagorean* is ſuppoſed to mean no leſs; by whom *Plato* is called Μωϋσῆς Ἀττικίζων. *Moſes Atticizing* (e). After theſe Teſtimonies of *Heathens*, and *Jews*, I may fitly enough cite that of the Ancient *Chriſtians*. *Clemens Alexandrinus* ſays that *Plato* was Προφητείαν γνωρίζων, i. e. *Acquainted with Prophecy* (f). This he ſays of him when he ſpeaks of his being in *Egypt*. He ſays elſewhere of him, that he kindled or revived, τὸ ἴταυσμα τῆς Ἑβραϊκῆς φιλοσοφίας. That is, *The light of the Hebrew Philoſophy* (g). *Plato* is by the ſame Author called, ἐξ Ἑβραίων φιλόσοφος, i. e. *A Philoſopher of the Hebrews* (h). *Juſtin* the *Martyr* affirms that *Plato* borrowed from the Writings of *Moſes* (i). And that he, as well as *Pythagoras* and others, went into *Egypt*; ἐκ τῆς Μωσέως ἱστορίας ὠφελησόμενος, i. e. Being *profited by the Hiſtory of* Moſes (k). *Theodorit* (l) and St. *Auguſtin* (m) ſpeak to the ſame purpoſe. There can be no doubt left but that *Plato* learnt his Theology in theſe Matters from the *Hebrews*, or from thoſe who derived it from thence. We have the Teſtimonies of all ſorts of Men; but have none at all that *Philo* the *Jew* learnt his

(d) *Joſeph. contra Apion.* l. 2.

(e) *Theodorit. Curat. Græc. affect.* l. 2.

(f) *Clem. Alexandr. Strom.* 1.

(g) *Pædag.* l. 2. c. 1.

(h) *Strom.* l. 1.

(i) *Juſtin. Mart. Apol.* 2.

(k) *Ad Græc. exhort.*

(l) *Curat. Græc. affect.* l. 2.

(m) *De Civitat. Dei*, l. 8. c. 11.

his from *Plato*. That is nothing but Surmiſe; it is deſtitute of all proof: whereas the former is atteſted by moſt unexceptionable Witneſſes.

One of the Ancient Writers of the Church, does not only affirm that *Plato* borrowed from *Moſes*, as the Ancient *Jews* as well as *Chriſtians* affirm, but he tells you whence his Materials were borrowed. Thus from *Exod.* 3. 14. where God calls himſelf ὁ ὤν, *Plato* borrowed his τὸ ὄν ἀεὶ. And from *Deut.* 6. 4. *The Lord our God is One Lord*, *Plato* affirms ἕνα θεόν i. e. *One God*. My Author goes on, and ſays, that *Moſes* did δύο θεολογεῖν κυρίους, i. e. *Speak of two Lords*, in thoſe words, *the Lord rained upon* Sodom *and* Gomorrha, *Brimſtone and Fire from the Lord out of Heaven*. And ſo does *David*, in thoſe words, *The Lord ſaid unto my Lord*. Here the λόγος, or Word is to be underſtood. It is expreſly ſaid by the *Pſalmiſt* in another place; *By the Word of the Lord were the Heavens made*, &c. And that Word which created them is the ſaving Word, mentioned elſewhere, *viz.* Pſ. 107. *v.* 20. who is elſewhere called Wiſdom, *Pro.* 8. This is that word called by *Philo* δεύτερος θεός. To this *Plato* ſpeaks very conformably when he ſays, ſpeaking of the World, ὃν ἔταξε λόγος πάντων θεῶν. Euſeb. *praparat.* l. 11. c. 9.

Gen 19. 24.

Pſal. 110. v. 1.

Pſ. 33. 6.

Euſeb. *ib.* c. 16.

θειότατος, i. e. *Which the most Divine Word established.* And *Plotinus* speaking of him who begets, adds, εἰκόνα δ' ἐκείνου οὗ λέγομεν τὸν Νοῦν, That is, But *the Image of him* (who begets) *we call the Intellect* or Mind.

3. *Plato* did teach the same Doctrine which *Philo* taught, or he did not. If he did not, he cannot be said to have received it from *Plato:* If he did teach the same (as is implied in the Exception) then another Difficulty will arise, which our Adversaries will be obliged to remove. And it is this, *viz.* whence *Plato* received this Theology? To say that he received it from some Philosophers which were before him, is to say nothing; Because the Question will return, *viz.* whence those Ancients received it? To say that the *H. Trinity* is knowable by the Light of Nature, is more than we can believe, and much more than our Adversaries will allow. Nor will they say that *Plato* or these Ancients were Divinely inspired: This would be to give up their whole Cause. They must then *either* devise it and forge it out of their own Brains; which is hard to conceive; because they could serve no end in that, nor can we conceive that *Plato* and other great Wits should easily embrace such a groundless

Belief:

Belief: *Or* elſe they muſt receive it by Tradition from the *Jews*. And if this be granted, we have gained our Point intirely.

4. That which weakens this Exception is this farther, that what *Philo* hath ſaid in this Matter agrees with what is ſaid by the other *Jewiſh* Authors mentioned before; who cannot reaſonably be ſuppoſed to have borrowed it either from *Philo*, or *Plato*, or any *Heathen* Philoſopher whatſoever. Such as the *Targumiſts*, I mean, and the Author of *Zohar*, and the *Midraſh Tillim*, &c. which I have mentioned before. They cannot with any ſhadow of reaſon be ſuppoſed to have borrowed from *Plato*. 'Tis well known (to thoſe who are acquainted with the *Jewiſh* VVritings) how much the *Jews* neglected and deſpiſed the *Greek* Language and Learning: And therefore it cannot be thought that they ever learned their Language, much leſs their Theology: And though what *Philo* ſays be of great VVeight and Value, yet that which renders it the more ſo is this, that others of his Nation have ſaid the ſame things, who lived in different times and Places, and who very probably had no knowledge of the VVritings of *Plato* and *Philo*.

Some

Excep. 2. Some few others perhaps may except against what hath been before said concerning this Matter, That it is a Novel Doctrine, and not the Doctrine of the Ancient and Catholick Church.

Answ. I am very sure that none can pretend this but Novices, who are not competently acquainted with the Ancient VVriters of the Church. I do appeal to those who are conversant in them in this Matter: Nor do I intend to be at the pains to transcribe Passages out of the Fathers to this purpose. I shall however take notice of one, which comes fully up to this Matter: And though the Passage be somewhat long, I shall not think much to transcribe it, because it is a very remarkable one. It is from *Theodorit*, in a Sermon of his against the *Gentiles*. He tells them what *Moses* had writ concerning the false Gods of the *Gentiles*, and that he required in his Law the Worship of the *One* True God. This Belief of *One* God *Moses* taught in his Law, and recommended the Worship of him only. Upon which he brings in the *Gentiles* objecting against the *Christians* thus: *Perhaps* (says he) *ye will say, ye* Christians *have not kept this Law inviolably; for ye preach not an* Unity, *but a* Trinity: *whereas the* Jews, *being brought up*

Theodorit. Cur. Græcar. affect. l. 2. περὶ ἀρχῶς.

up in the Writings of Moses and the Prophets, worship One only, and reprehend your Trinity. To whom he replies in the following words: Ἐγὼ δ, ὦ φίλοι ἄνδρες, ὑμῶν μὲ ξυλγνώμην αἰτῶ τῇ ὑπαίτιος, πῶ θείαν ὐκ ὀπτεμβῶν γεαφὼ Ἰωάννου δ πῶ ἰχαίτιω ἁμαρτίαν ὀφλῆσαι· ὅτι δὲ αἱρεσμῶσι, κ τ πεφῆτῶ, ὐκ χιλίαις, κ πασὶ δόμῶσι ἐκ παιδὸς μέχρι γήρως τὸ θεῖα, πῶ τῆς θεολογίας ἀγνοῆσαι φλήθειαν· ἐκ Αἰγύπτου δ αὐτῆς πλεῖστοι ἀφαιρέψαντας χρόνον, κ πῶ πολυθεΐαν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων μεμαθηκότας θρησκείαν, ὁ πάνσοφος κύριος, ὐκ ὀναρχῆν ἅπαντα τὰ περὶ τῆς τελάδος ἐξεταβῶσι δόγματα, ἵνα μὴ πεφασιν πολυθεΐας λαβῶσιν, ὡς τ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ὑπερβάντες πλάνης, ὐ μόνῶ παντὶ πάσι τὰ περὶ τῆς τελάδος ἀπόκρυφα δόγματα τοῖς ὕστερον ἐσομένοις, τῆς ὀνπλεστέρας θεολογίας κ βλασφήμων τὰς ἀφορμὰς ἀφέλοι τῆτο μονάδικῶς μὲ νομοθετῆσαι, ἐνετείλατο δῶς δ πῶ τελάδα μόνῶ τὸ γὰρ Ἄκουε Ἰσραὴλ, κύριος ὁ θεός σου, κύριος εἷς ἐστι, κ πῶ μονάδα διδάσκει, κ πῶ τελάδα δηλοῖ ἅπαξ γὰρ εἰπὼν τὸ Θεὸς, κ δις τὸ Κύριος ἐπιπτὼν, τ τελάδος τ ἀριθμὸν παρεδήλωσεν· ἐπαγαγὼν δὲ τὸ, εἷς ἐστι, κ πῶ προσκυνητὸν Ἰσραὴλ διδασκαλίαν περοπέτυγκε, κ τὸ τῶ τῆς θείας ὐσίας ἐμπνεῖν· μία γὰρ ἐστ ἀγίας τελάδος κ ὐσία κ δυνάμις, κ μήτι τε κ βάλησις· ταὐτὸν πι κ τῶν ἀγράτων δυνάμεων οἱ χροὶ τῶν θεῶν τ ὑμνον περοφέρεσιν, περὶς

Deut. 6. v. 4

Isa. 6.

μὲν τὸ Ἅγιος, ἅπαξ δὲ τὸ Κύριος λέγουσι· τῷ μὲν τῶν ἰδιοτήτων δηλοῦντες τὸν ἀριθμόν· τῷ δὲ τὸ κοινὸν τῆς δεσποτείας μηνύοντες· ἀλλ' ἐν τούτοις μὲν δὲ αἰνιγμάτων τὰ τῆς θείας τριάδος δεδήλωται· ἐν ἑτέροις δὲ γε σαφέστερον ταῦτα διδάσκουσιν οἱ θεσπέσιοι ἄνδρες. Μωϋσῆς μὲν γὰρ ὁ θειότατος, τὴν κοσμογένειαν ξυγγράφων, εἶτα τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου διάπλασιν ἐξηγούμενος, ἔφη τὸν τοῦ παντὸς εἰρηκέναι Θεόν τε καὶ δημιουργὸν, ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν· εἶτα ἐπήγαγεν, ὡς ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν· καὶ θεὸν ὠνόμασε τόν τε πεποιηκότα τὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ τὸν οὗ πρὸς μίμησιν ἐξετύπωσεν ὃν διέπλασεν· οὐκ ἐπειδὴ ἄλλο τούτου καὶ ἄλλο γε ὀκείνου τὸ εἶδος· μία γὰρ δὴ τῆς τριάδος ἡ φύσις· τούτου γὰρ δὴ χάριν, καὶ τὸν θεὸν ἔφησεν εἰρηκέναι, Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν· καὶ ἐπήγαγε, Κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν, ἵνα δείξῃ τὸ τῶν προσώπων διάφορον· καὶ δὴ καὶ τῷ Νῶε περὶ κρεωφαγίας νομοθετῶν, καὶ τοῦ αἵματος ἀπαγορεύων τὴν ἐδωδὴν, ἔφη τὸν τῶν ὅλων εἰρηκέναι θεὸν, Ἔδεσθε πάντα ὡς λάγανα χόρτου· πλὴν κρέας ἐν αἵματι ψυχῆς οὐκ ἔδεσθε· καὶ γὰρ τὸ ὑμέτερον αἷμα ἐκζητήσω· ἐκ πάντων τῶν θηρίων ἐκζητήσω αὐτὸ, καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς ἀνθρώπου ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκζητήσω αὐτό· ὁ ἐκχέων αἷμα ἀνθρώπου, ἀντὶ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ ἐκχυθήσεται, ὅτι ἐν εἰκόνι θεοῦ ἐποίησα τὸν ἄνθρωπον· οὐκ ἔφη, ἐν εἰκόνι ἐμαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐν εἰκόνι θεοῦ,

Gen. 1. v. 26, 27.

Gen. 9.

τῶν

τῆς περσῶν πάλιν δεικνὺς τὸ διάφορον· καὶ
ἵνικα ὁ κῦ παύτων συλλεγόμενος οἱ κῦ τῶ πε-
ποιηκότ Θ. λυτελοῦντες, τὸν πύργον οἰκεῖον ἀ-
κοδόμων τὸν μέγιστον, τῆς τῆς γλωττῶν συγ-
χύσεως τὸν ἐπώνυμον, φάναι τὸν θεὸν εἰρῆκεν Gen. 11.7.
ὁ νομοθέτης, Δεῦτε, καὶ καταβάντες, συγχεωμεν
αὐτῶν τὰς γλώσσας· καὶ τὸ μὲ Καταβάντες συγ-
χεωμεν, δῆλοι τὸ ὁμότιμον· ἢ γὰ εἶπεν Κατα-
ξηνδι ἢ Καταβάτω, ὅπερ δὴ τοῖς ἀπηκόοις καὶ
περιπατουμένοις ἁρμόττει· ἀλλὰ, Καταβάντες
συγχεωμεν, ὁ σαφῶς δηλοῖ τὴν ἰσότητα· τὸ δὲ
Δεῦτε, τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα σημαίνει, τῆς
δημιουργίας τοὺς κοινωνοὺς ἐναδὴ γὰ καὶ Ζα-
πλατίων τὸν ἄνδρωπον, ἔφη, Παπτωμεν ἄν-
δρωπον κατ εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ ὁμοίω-
σιν, εἰκότως ἀρα καὶ μειζόνων εἰς πολλὰς τὴν
μίαν φωνὴν, συνεργὸς λαμβάνει τὸν υἱὸν καὶ
τὸ συναίτιον πνεῦμα· χρόνῳ δ ὕστερον, πρω-
τόπροι καὶ κεραυνοὶς ἀπολωλοτα τὰ Σοδόμα βιλο-
θεῖς καὶ τὰς ἀγχιτέρμονας πόλεις, τῆς ἀσεβεί-
ας καὶ ἀθεμιτότητος τοὺς κοινωνοὺς, διὰδε κυρίου Gen. 19.24.
ἡμῶν ἐπέδειξε, καὶ φησὶ Μωϋσῆς ὁ ταῦτα ξυγγρα-
ψας· Καὶ ἔβρεξε κύριος ἐπὶ Σοδομα καὶ ἐπὶ Γομορρα
θεῖον καὶ πῦρ παρὰ κυρίου ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· Καὶ ἵνα μὴ τὰ παρελαίβοι τὴν τῶν μόνον τὴν
περιπόλεως τὰ περὶ τῆς ἴσης χρόνους τελεί-
σθ Θ. ἀκούσατε, οἱ φιλότεκνοι καὶ τὰ ἐκγονικὰ βο-
ῶντ Θ. Δαβίδ. Τῷ λόγῳ κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστε-
ρεώθησ, καὶ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματ Θ. αὐτοῦ Psal. 33.6.
πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν· καὶ πάλιν, Εἶπεν ὁ κύ-
ριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως Ps. 110.1.

αν

ἂν δῶ τὲς ἐχθρός σε ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σε· καὶ μὴ βεαχέα ᾖ, πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν κύριον ὁ τῷ κυρίῳ λέγει παῖδε, Ἐκ γαςρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε· καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ ψαλμῷ, Ὁ θρόνος σου ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος, ῥάβδος εὐθύτητος ἡ ῥάβδος τῆς βασιλείας σε· ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην, καὶ ἐμίσησας ἀνομίαν· διὰ τῦτο ἔχρισέ σε ὁ θεός σου ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιάσεως παρὰ τὸς μετόχους σε· τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ καὶ ἡμῖν διδασκαλίαν καὶ Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης, καὶ Ἱερεμίας, καὶ Ἰεζεκιὴλ, καὶ Δανιὴλ, καὶ Ζαχαρίας, καὶ Μιχαίας, καὶ ἅπας ὁ τύτων προσφέρει χρός. That is; *O Friends, I think you to be fit to be pardoned, being ignorant of the Holy Scripture; but I cannot but lament the extream Ignorance of the* Jews, *becauſe they being carried from the Womb, as the Prophet ſpeaks, and inſtructed in Divine things from their Childhood to Old-age, are ignorant of the true Theology. For they continuing a long time in* Egypt, *and learning Polytheiſm there, the All-wiſe God did not think fit plainly to reveal to them the Myſtery of the* Trinity, *that they might not under that Pretext fall into the Polytheiſm of* Egypt. *And yet did He not altogether conceal the Doctrine of the* Trinity *from thoſe who were to come, ſowing ſome of the Seeds of the more perfect Theology. And therefore he gave the Law under the Repreſentation of* ONE, *but did* Ænigmatically *inſinuate the* Trinity.

Pſ. 45.6,7.

Trinity. *For thoſe words,* Hear, O *Iſrael,* Deut. 6. 4.
the Lord our God *IS ONE* Lord, *teach plainly both the* UNITY, *and the* TRINITY. *For* GOD *being once, and* LORD *twice named, declare the* Trinity. *For adding,* IS ONE, *he delivered a Doctrine agreeable to the* Jews, *and expreſſed the* UNITY *of the Divine Nature: For* ONE *is the Eſſence, Power and Will of the* Trinity. *And therefore the Company of the Inviſible Powers ſinging an Hymn to God, ſay* HOLY *thrice, but* LORD *but once:* Iſa. 6. *By the firſt declaring the Number of* [*Perſonal*] *Properties; by the other ſignifying the Common Dominion: But hereby the* Trinity *was Enigmatically declared. But elſewhere Holy Men taught it more plainly: For the moſt Divine* Moſes, *writing the Hiſtory of the Creation of the World, and relating the Creation of Man, affirms that God, the Creator of all things, ſaid,* Let us make Man according to our Image; Gen. 1. 26, 27. *and adds, that God created Man,* according to the Image of God made he him: *Relating that God made Man, and according to whoſe Image he made him: Not that the One and the Other were of a different kind; for the Nature of the* Trinity *is one and the ſame. And there he ſaith, that God ſaid,* Let us make Man in our Image, after Gen. 1. 26. our likeneſs: *And he added,* in the Image

of God created he him, *that he might ſhew the difference of Perſons. And when God commanded* Noah *concerning the eating of Fleſh, and forbad him the eating of Blood, he affirms that the God of the Univerſe ſaid,* Gen 9 v. 3, 4, 5, 6. Every moving thing that liveth ſhall be meat for you; even as the green Herb have I given you all things: But Fleſh with the Life thereof, which is the Blood thereof, ſhall you not eat. And ſurely your Blood of your lives will I require: At the hand of every Beaſt will I require it; and at the hand of Man, at the hand of every Man's Brother, will I require the Life of Man. Whoſo ſheddeth Man's Blood, by Man ſhall his Blood be ſhed; For in the Image of God made he Man. *He does not ſay, in my Image,* but in the Image of God, *ſhewing the diſtinction of Perſons. And when thoſe Men met together, who were incenſed againſt their Maker, to build the Tower, that great Tower which had its Name from Confuſion,* Moſes Gen. 11. 7. *affirms, that God ſaid* Go to, let us go down, and there confound their Language: Let us go down and confound *ſhews a parity of honour. But the Word* δεῦτε, i. e. Go to, *ſignifies the Son and Spirit, who were joined in the Creation. For ſeeing that when he made Man, he ſaid,* Let us make Man in our Image, after our likeneſs; *Agreeably hereunto,*

hereunto, now he is dividing one Language into many, he takes to him his Fellow-workers, the Son and moſt Holy Spirit. In aftertime, being about to deſtroy Sodom, *and its neighbouring Cities, Partners of her Prophaneneſs and Wickedneſs, with Thunder and Fire from Heaven, he mentions to us two Lords. Thus* Moſes *writes*; Then the Lord rained upon *Sodom* and upon *Gomorrah* Brimſtone and Fire from the Lord out of Heaven. *But leſt any ſhould think that this Prophet,* viz. MOSES, *only ſpeaks of the* Trinity, *Hear, O my Friends, what Divine* DAVID *ſays*; By the word of the Lord were the Heavens made, and all the Hoſt of them by the Breath of his Mouth. *And again,* The Lord ſaid unto my Lord, ſit thou at my Right-hand, untill I make thine Enemies thy Foot-ſtool. *And ſoon after, the ſame Lord, the Father of that Lord, ſaith,* From the Womb of the Morning, *&c. And in another Pſalm,* Thy Throne, O God, is for ever: the Sceptre of thy Kingdom is a right Sceptre. Thou loveſt Righteouſneſs and hateſt Wickedneſs: therefore God, thy God hath anointed thee with the Oil of Gladneſs above thy Fellows. *The ſame Doctrine is delivered to us by* Iſaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, *and* Daniel, Zechariah, *and* Michah, *and all the Company of Prophets.*

Gen. 19. 24.

Pſal. 33. 6.

Pſ. 110. 1.

v. 3.

Pſ. 45. 6, 7.

It were eaſie to quote many other Paſſages to the ſame purpoſe if it were needfull: but I will not ſwell the Book with them, nor give the Reader that needleſs trouble. VVhat I have produced is of great Moment, and very much to the Purpoſe.

He gives an Account of *Deut.* 6. 4. agreeably to what hath been given before from the *Zohar*. He makes the ſame uſe of *Iſa.* 6. that hath been mentioned in the foregoing Chapter. What hath been obſerved from *Gen.* 1. 26, 27. we ſee was the ſenſe of the Ancient *Chriſtians*. And for *Gen.* 19. 24. he interprets as the *Targumiſt*, as *Philo* doth.

Having premiſed theſe things, I ſhall now proceed to ſhew that the *Jewiſh Kabbala* concerning the Word, and H. Trinity, was not unknown to the *Gentiles*. Some of the wiſeſt and moſt celebrated Philoſophers had ſome knowledge of theſe Myſteries. I will not ſay that the *Hebrews Kabbala* was preſerved among the *Gentiles* ſincere and unblended; that it received no Adulteration, in paſſing through many hands: But this I may affirm, that the Tradition, as to the Subſtance of it, was preſerved. And as this Doctrine among the *Gentiles* muſt be derived from the Books of the Old Teſtament, and the *Kabbala* among the *Jews*, ſo this Doctrine, as it

it is taught by the *Gentiles*, is a very great Confirmation of the truth, and is very ſerviceable to our common *Chriſtianity*; as I ſhall have occaſion more particularly to obſerve afterwards. And for my more orderly proceeding in this Matter I ſhall ſhew,

Firſt, That the *Heathens* did receive from the *Jews* many of thoſe things which we now read in their Books.

Secondly, That this does more particularly appear from the Writings of *Plato*.

Thirdly, I ſhall ſhew the Reader what the *Heathens* have delivered concerning the λόγος, and the *H. Trinity*.

Fourthly, I ſhall repreſent to the Reader the ſerviceableneſs of this to our common *Chriſtianity*.

I. That the *Heathens* did receive from the *Jews* many of thoſe things which we now read in their Books.

The Names of Places and Countries, and Perſons, which we find among the Ancient *Heathen* Writers, are confeſſedly derived from the words made uſe of by *Moſes*. And here, I believe, we have no diſpute with any Learned Men. A very Learned Man affirms, *Ex uno Capite Moſis*, &c. That is, *That from one Chapter of* Moſes, *rightly underſtood, may be collected*

both a greater Number, and more certain Proofs of the Original of People, than from all the moſt Ancient Monuments of Antiquity which we have.

S. Bochart. Præfat. in Phaleg.

But then it is alſo very clear, that the Mythologies of the Ancient *Heathens* were grounded upon ſome Relations in *Moſes*, or in ſome other Writings of the Old Teſtament. This is very often true, and ſometimes ſo apparently and evidently ſo, that no Man can with any Colour deny it. It is not credible that it can in ſeveral Caſes be otherwiſe; ſo very remarkable are the Correſpondencies between the firſt Ground and Account of things which the Scripture gives, and that Account given by the *Heathen* Mythogoliſts, who have turned the firſt Relation into Fable.

Nor can it ſeem ſtrange that the Truth ſhould be diſguiſed, and the Original *Kabbala* corrupted, conſidering the Decay of Knowledge, the Increaſe of Idolatry, and the Confuſion of Languages; and the general Corruption of Mankind, and Fabulouſneſs of the Poets. Hence it came to paſs that *Noah*'s Flood was repreſented, ſometimes, under the Names of *Deucalion* and *Ogyges*; and that the Original Names of Perſons, and Relation of things was diſguiſed, by ſubſtituting other Names,

and

and putting the Relation into other Characters.

I ſhall not enlarge upon this Subject, it having been handled by ſeveral Learned Men, upon one occaſion or other. I ſhall content my ſelf with ſome Inſtances that are more remarkable, and pregnant Proofs of what I have aſſerted.

And the firſt I ſhall mention is the Hiſtory of *Noah*, and his three Sons. This is by the *Mythologiſts*, who were *Heathens*, repreſented under the Names of *Saturn* and his Sons, in ſuch a manner that it is very eaſie to diſcern from whence all that Mythology was derived.

I begin with *Saturn*, and will ſhew what theſe *Mythologiſts* have reported of him; and afterwards ſhew whence theſe fabulous Reports were taken, and how fitly they belong to *Noah*. *Firſt*, Then, *Saturn*, hath been obſerved to be called in the Hymns of *Orpheus* Πατηρ and Γενάρχης, That is, *The Father or Origin of* at leaſt *Humane Race*: And his Wife expreſly called the *Mother of mortal Men*: Upon which Account, I ſuppoſe, it was, that it hath been believed that he was ſubſtituted in the room of *Adam*, but without ſufficient Ground. *Secondly*, *Saturn* is much cried up for his Juſtice, and his times for the Golden Age, free from Op-

Bochart. Phaleg. l. 1. c. 1.

V. Voſſii de Theolog. Gent. l. 1. c. 18.

preſſion, and from Property; which latter is the occaſion of the former. *Thirdly*, It is ſaid, that in thoſe times Men had converſation by a common Language with Beaſts. *Fourthly*, *Saturn* is ſaid to be married to the Earth: And his Wife *Rhea* is taken for the Earth. *Fifthly*, Husbandry, and the skill in planting Vines, and making Wine, is by the *Heathens* attributed to *Saturn*. *Sixthly*, *Saturn* is ſaid to preſide over Drunkenneſs; and the *Saturnalia*, dedicated to him, were Feaſts of Exceſs in that Kind, and of great Liberty to Servants. *Laſtly*, That *Saturn* made a Law that none ſhould be permitted to ſee the Gods naked. I might proceed farther: I ſhall not do it, but inſtead thereof,

I ſhall ſhew how theſe particulars agree to the Story of *Noah*.

And as to the *Firſt*, where it is ſaid that *Saturn* was the *Father or Origin of Humane Race*, and his Wife *Rhea* the *Mother of mortal Men*; this may with great Congruity be applied to *Noah*, and his Wife; for there are no Perſons after the General Flood, and Deſtruction of Humane Race, to whom this can be truly applied but to them only: And hence it was that ſome Learned Men have applied this to *Adam*, and to *Eve*. But there is no

no need of going up ſo far; and what I ſhall have occaſion to add afterwards will determine this to *Noah*, and his Wife; who after the Flood muſt be allowed to be the common Parents of Mankind.

As to the *Second*, the Congruity is no leſs. If *Saturn* be cried up for his Juſtice and Righteouſneſs, ſo is *Noah* likewiſe. Of him it is ſaid, that he was a *Juſt Man and perfect in his Generation*; and that he *walked with God*. And not only that he was *Righteous*, but alſo a *Preacher of Righteouſneſs*. He was *Righteous in the time of Wrath*, ſays the Son of *Sirach*. That which adds to his Character is this, that he was ſo when all Fleſh was corrupted, and *the Wickedneſs of Man was great in the Earth*. And this I take to be intimated in thoſe words, where God ſaid to him, *Thee have I ſeen righteous before me in* THIS *Generation:* To be righteous in a depraved and corrupt Age, as *Noah* was, adds much to his Character. And what the Scripture ſays of him in this reſpect is very Emphatical. To all which the Author of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* adds, that he became the *Heir of Righteouſneſs*. In his time was that Golden Age of which the *Heathens* ſpeak ſo frequently, when there was neither Claim of Property or Oppreſſion, or Violence.

Gen. 6. 9. 2 Pet. 2. 5. Eccluſ. 44. 17. Gen. 6. 5. Gen. 7. v. 1. Heb. 11. 7.

To

To this time the Poets words are to be referred;

Martial. l. 12. Epigr. 62.

Antiqui Rex Magne Poli, mundique prioris;
Sub quo pigra quies, nec labor ullus erat,
Nec regale nimis fulmen, nec fulmine digna:
Sciſſa nec ad manes; ſed ſita dives Hu-
[*mus.*

And all this admirably agrees with the Prediction of *Lamech*, the Father of *Noah*; who called his Name *Noah*, ſaying, *This*
Gen. 5.29. *ſame ſhall comfort us concerning our Work, and Toil of our Hands, becauſe of the Ground which the Lord hath curſed.*

Thirdly, Whereas it is ſaid that in the times of *Saturn* Men had converſation by a common Language (not only with one another but) with the Beaſts alſo; this ſeems to be drawn from thoſe words, *Gen.* 11. v. 1. *And the whole Earth was of one Language, and of one Speech.*

Fourthly, *Saturn* is ſaid by the *Mythologiſts* to be married to the Earth. And his Wife *Rhea* is by them taken for the Earth. This is moſt exactly agreeable to the Text of *Moſes*, and there can hardly be any doubt but it was taken from
Gen. 9.20. thence. It is ſaid that *Noah began to be an Husbandman.* So we render the words; and, the Context conſidered, that rendring

is

is not blameable. But what we render *Husbandman* is in the *Hebrew* איש האדמה, which words do ſignifie *Husband of the Earth*, and might eaſily give ground to the *Mythogoliſts* for their Fable.

Fifthly, Husbandry, and the skill in planting Vines, and making Wine, is by the *Heathens* attributed to *Saturn*. And of *Noah* it is ſaid, that he was an *Husbandman*, and *planted a Vineyard*. Gen. 9 20.

Sixthly, *Saturn* is ſaid to preſide over Drunkenneſs; and the *Saturnalia*, which were dedicated to him, were Feſtivals of great Exceſs of that kind, and of great licentiouſneſs. 'Tis certain that *Noah* did not only plant a Vineyard, *but he drank of the Wine and was drunken*. Gen 9.21. And upon that Account the Practice began, and the Relation of *Saturn* was grounded.

Laſtly, The Poets affirm that *Saturn* made a Law that no Man ſhould, under a Penalty, ſee the Gods naked. We know that it is ſaid that *Noah* was not only Drunken, but alſo that he was uncovered in his Tent: That his Son ſaw his Nakedneſs, and his Poſterity was curſed upon that Account: Nay, we are aſſured from our Holy Writers, that this Curſe light on them, and the Effects of it were direfull.

I pro-

I proceed to the Sons of *Noah*, and of *Saturn* alſo. It is by the *Heathen* Poets ſaid, that *Saturn* devoured all his Children, excepting the three which were famous among the Ancients, *viz. Jupiter*, *Neptune*, and *Pluto*; and that theſe ſurviving Sons divided among them the whole Earth. This is very applicable to *Noah*, who might be ſaid to deſtroy the reſt of Mankind, as he was a Prophet, and predicted their Deſtruction. For it is very common, in the Scripture-Language, to impute the Event to the Prophet, which the Prophet does only foretell. Thus the Chief Butler, tells *Pharaoh* how truly *Joſeph* had predicted the Fate of him, and the Chief Baker: *And it came to paſs* (ſays he) *as he interpreted to us, ſo it was: me he reſtored unto mine Office, and him he hanged.* Thus the *dividing them in* Jacob, *and ſcattering them in* Iſrael, can import no more, but the foretelling ſuch a dividing, &c. And *Noah* is expreſly ſaid to have *condemned the World.* And in this ſenſe *Noah* might truly be ſaid to have deſtroyed the World.

Gen. 41. 11. ch. 49. 7. Heb. 11. 7.

And for his three Sons, *Shem*, *Ham* and *Japhet*, who were ſaved with him in the Ark, they are the very ſame with the three Sons of *Saturn*; as, I believe, will ſufficiently appear upon farther conſideration of the matter. I will

I will begin with *Ham*, who ſaw his Father's Nakedneſs, and was the younger Son of *Noah*, and was the occaſion of the Curſe which *Noah* pronounced, and was that very Perſon whom the *Heathen Mythologiſts* muſt be underſtood of, when they ſpeak of *Jove*, or *Jupiter*: His Portion or Lot fell in the barren and *naked* Sands of *Africa*, where he was for many Ages worſhipped under the Title of *Jupiter Ham*, or *Jupiter Hammon*. *Herodotus* ſays expreſly Ἀμμῶν Αἰγύπτιοι καλέουσι τὸν Δία· i. e. *The* Egyptians *call* Jupiter *by the Name of* Ammon; and thence he affirms that a Neighbouring People are called *Ammonians*. The Scripture mentions him under the Title of *Amon*, or *Hamon*, as a very Learned Man hath well obſerved, *v. g. Jer.* 46. 25. We render it, indeed, *Behold, I will puniſh the Multitude of* No: But what we render, the *Multitude of* No, is in the *Hebrew* אֶת־אָמוֹן מִנֹּא, i. e. *Amon* of *No*, i. e. the God *Amon* in honour of whom a Temple was dedicated in the City of *No*. And hence it is obſerved that the City *No* is ſometimes called by a compound Name, *Amon No*, and *No Amon*. Thus *Ezek.* 30. v. 15. I will cut off *Amon No*: we render it indeed *the Multitude of* No, without ſufficient ground. We find *No* mentioned again, *v.* 16. No

Herodot. Euterpe.

Bochart. Geogr. Sacr. l. 1. c. 1. Jer. 46. 25.

v. Dr Cudworth's Intellect. Syſtem, p. 340.

ſhall

ſhall be rent aſunder; where the *Seventy* render thoſe words thus; Ἐν Διοσπόλει ἔσται ἴχρημα: That is, there *ſhall be a rent in the City of* Jupiter, ſc. *Hamon.*

Nahu. 3.8. Again, *Art thou better than* No Amon? we render it indeed *populous No*; but our Marginal Reading, from the *Hebrew* Text, lets us know that it is *No Amon* in the Original. And to ſuppoſe that by *No Amon* in that place is meant *Alexandria*, is to ſuppoſe that the Prophet borrows a Compariſon or Similitude from a place not in Being: For it is not to be believed that *Alexandria* was before *Alexander* who built it, and from whom it had its Name. He that will ſee more of this Argument may conſult *Bochartus.*

This Name of *Ham* or *Ammon*, 'tis thought obtained in *Africa* and *Arabia* ſo far, that it gave a Denomination to a *River* of that Name, to a *Promontory*, a *People* (as I have obſerved from *Herodotus*) a *City*, a *Province*, as well as to a famous *Temple*. *Egypt* it ſelf, from *Ham*, is called the Land of *Ham.*

Beſides, *Ham* and Ζεὺς ſignifie alike, and denote Heat. *Ham* was of *Noah*, *Jupiter* of *Saturn*, the youngeſt Son.

I proceed next to *Japhet*, the ſame with the *Heathen's Neptune*: He is ſaid to preſide over the Sea. As *Africa* was the Lot of

of *Ham*, ſo *Shem* had vaſt Territories in *Aſia*; but *Japhet* had in his ſhare many Iſlands, and ſuch places as were in great Meaſure incompaſſed with the *Sea's*. I will not inſiſt upon the Teſtimony produced out of *Lactantius* by the Learned *Bochart*. It is acknowledged by an *Heathen* Author of much greater Antiquity; I mean *Plato*. He tells us that when the Gods took their ſeveral Lots in the diſtribution of the Earth, ſome more and ſome leſs, and appointed their Worſhip and their Temples, *Neptune* took the *Atlantic* Iſland for his ſhare, and that he placed his Children, begotten of a Mortal Woman, in a part of that Iſland. It is agreed on all hands that *Japhet* had his Lot in the Iſlands of the Mediterranean *Sea*, and thence into *Europe*: And from him it is Men are called by *Horace*, *Iapeti genus*. It is ſaid, *God ſhall enlarge* Japheth, *Gen.* 9. v. 27. And 'tis obſerved by *Bochart*, that both *Neptune* and the *Greek* word Ποσειδων comes from a word that denotes Enlargement or Latitude.

Platonis Critias.

Voſſius de Theol. Gentili. l. 1. c. 15.

I proceed to *Shem*, whoſe Family God choſe for his peculiar People, and out of whoſe Family Jeſus Chriſt proceeded, according to the Fleſh. He is thought to be the ſame which the *Heathen* meant by *Pluto*; who was allowed to be a God, indeed,

deed; but the Idolatrous *Heathens*, out of their Hatred to Piety, detruded him, and allowed him only to be an inferior one.

Bochart. Phaleg. Voſſius de Idolatr. Dickenſoni Delphi Phœnic.

I will not purſue this matter to the Grand-children of *Noah*, nor to After-times. That hath been done by divers Learned Men with great Succeſs, whom the Curious may conſult. It would be too great a Digreſſion in this place to enlarge upon this matter. I have produced a few Inſtances, out of a vaſt Number which might have been inſiſted on. I ſhall therefore now proceed to ſhew,

II. That this does more particularly appear from the Writings of *Plato*. I have in ſome meaſure obſerved this above: I ſhall now proceed in this matter. Thus much, I doubt not, will appear, that *Plato* had read the Writings of *Moſes*; or at leaſt had been informed in the *Jewiſh Kabbala*, and in the Doctrine of the Sacred Books of the Old Teſtament.

Platon. Convivium, p. 189.

The firſt place I ſhall mention is a paſſage in his *Convivium*. That Book is a Dialogue concerning *Love*, and the Praiſes of it. When others had delivered their Opinions, it came to the turn of *Ariſtophanes* to deliver his; which he alſo did. And thus he begins his Speech: Δεῖ δὲ ἡμᾶς πρῶτον, &c. That is, *But we muſt firſt underſtand*

stand Humane Nature and the Affections of it. For our Humane Nature was not of Old what it is now, but diverse from it: For at the first there were three Sorts of Humane Race; not, as now it is, two only, Male and Female, but there was a third, being common and made up of both these; the Name whereof now remains only, the thing is destroyed. For Man and Woman were then one kind, and had one Name in common, being made up of the Male and Female; but now there is nothing left of that Sort but the reproachfull Name only. He goes on and tells that Mankind in that first and primitive State, before the Male and Female were divided, *was round, encompassed with back and sides, had four hands and feet,* καὶ πρόσωπα δύο, i. e. *and two faces.* That after, upon an occasion which he mentions, he says *Jupiter* resolved to divide this Creature into two, and so he did, Ἔτεμνε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους δίχα, i. e. *He did divide Mankind in two*; and after this the one did desire and imbrace τὸ ἥμισυ τὸ αὐτοῦ, i. e. *its other part.* And hence it comes to pass that these two (which were at first but one) do naturally desire their other part; this Natural Love ἐπιχειρῶν ποιῆσαι ἓν ἐκ δυοῖν, καὶ ἰάσασθαι τὴν φύσιν τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην, i. e. *endeavouring to make One of Two* (again) *and to heal Humane*

Nature. Thus does he express himself, and adds soon after, Ζητεῖ δ' ἀεὶ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἕκαστον ξύμβολον. That is, *That each part now seeks its Fellow.* I shall now shew how exactly all this agrees with the Text of *Moses*, and with the *Jewish Kabbala.*

With the Text of *Moses* nothing can be more agreeable than this Account is. It is expresly said, *God created Man in his own Image, in the Image of God created he him, Male and Female created he them.* The very least that can be concluded from these words is, that the Woman was at least virtually and potentially created in the same Body. And not only the Text above cited, but what follows afterwards (*ch.*2. v.21,22.) do sufficiently teach us no less. God is said to have created *Man*, to have created *Him*, and to have created *Them.* What he created at first was certainly the Original and Sourse of all Humane Kind. The very Text of *Moses* gave a fair ground for what *Aristophanes* affirms.

Gen. 1.27.

But still his words are more agreeable to the *Jewish Kabbala.* For it was the Opinion of *R. Nachman* (as *Menasseh Ben-Israel* tells us) that *Adam* and *Eve* were at first made together, and that *Eve* was joined to him, in such manner, that *Adam* was in the front and *Eve* behind him. And the Author of the *Rabboth* affirms that

Men. Ben-Israel Concil p. 14. *Rabboth* fol.9.col.3. *Edit Amsteled.*

that *Nachman* was of a belief, that this Body was *Androgynous*, and that God made the firſt Man, as *Ariſtophanes* reports it, with דו פרצופין two Faces. This was the Opinion, as *M. B. Iſrael* affirms, of *R. Solomon*, *Ab. Ezra*, *R. Babye*, *R. Eliezer*, and *R. Iſaac Karus*. And what is ſaid of God's taking a *Rib*, they underſtand of a Side or Moyety of the Body. This is certain, that the word we render *Rib* does elſewhere ſignifie a *Side*, in the Law of *Moſes*. And according to this Opinion, God divided this firſt Body into two parts, as it is expreſly ſaid in *Plato*. My Author (who was alſo of this Opinion himſelf) adds that becauſe thoſe parts were full of Blood, it is ſaid, *that God cloſed up* Gen. 2. 21. *the Fleſh inſtead thereof*. And that becauſe in all this here was no Creation, therefore the words *Bara* and *Jatzar* are not here made uſe of. And that, where it is ſaid, *it is not good that Man ſhould be alone, I will make him an help meet for him*, or, as *before him*, the meaning is not that Man was at any time without a Wife, but that God thought it fit to divide his Body, and place that part which was *behind* him, *before* him. And to this purpoſe he applies the words of the *Pſalmiſt*; *Thou haſt beſet me behind and before.* I Pſ. 139. 5. will not concern my ſelf in this matter,

nor determine in this Controverſie among the *Jews*. I muſt ſay however that this Account is not to be contemned, as it hath ſometimes been by ſome *Chriſtians* of great Name. It is enough, at preſent, that the *Jew* I quoted before owns that *Plato* took his Fable (as he calls it) from the Hiſtory of *Moſes*. And this Account which I laſt gave of the Creation of Man, from the *Jewiſh* Writers, is no new Opinion, but both very Ancient, and a *Catholick* Doctrine among the *Jewiſh* Doctors.

This particular alone does ſufficiently, and irrefragably, prove what it is produced for; *viz.* that *Plato* was acquainted with the Writings of *Moſes*; or at leaſt that he was not a ſtranger to the Doctrine, and the *Kabbala* of that People.

It would be too great a Digreſſion in this place to enlarge much more upon this Subject: 'Tis an Argument well worth the pains and labour of Learned Men; but I am obliged to touch upon it only ſo far as my preſent Argument does require. But the curious Reader that would have farther proofs of this kind, may conſult one of the Ancient Writers of the Church, who will give him, out of *Plato*, many inſtances to the ſame purpoſe: Such as theſe; the Paradiſe ſpoken of by *Moſes* is repreſented by *Plato* under the

Euſeb. *Prapar.* l. 12. c. 11, 19. *&c.*

the *Idea* of the Garden of *Jupiter*, and the fraud of the Serpent by the insidious Practice of *Penia*: He teacheth, conformably to the Holy Scripture, that things inferior are the Symbols of heavenly things; and very many other things that are very agreeable to what we read in the Old Testament. I proceed:

III. I shall shew the Reader what the Ancient *Heathens* have delivered concerning the λόγος, and the H. *Trinity*.

And under this Head I shall have a fair occasion of considering what *Plato* hath taught in this matter: And by that time I hope it will appear, that our Doctrine of the H. *Trinity* is not a Novelty, or devised by *Justin Martyr*, whatever some Men insinuate or averr upon this occasion.

It is well known that the Ancient *Persians* worshipped the Sun under the Name of *Mithras*; and it is commonly known that that *Mithras* was frequently cal'ed τρισμέγιστος, i. e. *threefold* or *triplicated*: The reason whereof hath been inquired into by several Learned Men. It hath been thought that with *respect* to the *Light*, *Heat* and *Distinction* of times caused by the Sun, it was so called: And by another, that it was so called with regard to the *Wisdom*, *Goodness*, and *Power* of God. *Vossius de Idol. l. 2. c. 9.*

It was rather an Indication of a *Trinity* in
Dr. C. the *Persian* Theology, as a very Learned Writer of our own observes.

The Fragments which we have of the *Chaldean* Oracles are by no means to be despised. They cannot with any reason be supposed to be forged by *Christians*, because there are some things in them that are Magical, and abhorring from the *Christian* Principles. We may from those Fragments learn that this Doctrine was admitted in the Theology of the Ancient *Chaldees*. I shall mention some of these Fragments.

Ὅπου πατρικὴ μονάς ἐστι,
Ταναὴ ἐστι μόνας, ἢ δύο γεννᾶ.

Δυὰς γὰρ σπερὰ τῷ δὲ κάθηται, καὶ νοεραῖς ἀστράπτει τομαῖς.

Καὶ τὸ κυβερνᾶν τὰ πάντα, καὶ τάττειν ἕκαστον οὐ ταχθέν.

Πάντι γὰρ ἐν κόσμῳ λάμπει τριὰς ἧς μονὰς ἄρχει.

Ἀρχὴ πάσην τμήσεως ἡ δὲ ἡ τάξις.

Ἐις τρία γὰρ νοῦς εἶπε πατρὸς τέμνεσθαι ἅπαντα,

Ὃν τὸ θέλειν κατένευσε, καὶ ἤδη πάντα ἐτέτμητο.

Ἐις τρία γὰρ νοῦς εἶπε πατρὸς αἰδίου,
Νῷ πάντα κυβερνῶν.
Καὶ ἐφάνησαν ἐν αὐτῇ ἡ τ' ἀρετὴ καὶ ἡ σοφία,
Καὶ ἡ πολύφρων ἀτρέκεια.

Τῇ

Τῇ τῶνδε ῥέει τριάδος δέμας πρὸ τῆς ἥδης,
Οὐ πρώτης, ἀλλ' οὗ τὰ μετρεῖται.
Ἀρχαῖς γὰρ τρισὶ ταῖς δ' λάβοις δυλόνειν ἅπαντα.

These words I find thus Translated to my hand:

Where the Paternal Monad *is,*

The Monad *is enlarged, which generates Two.*

For the Duad *sits by him, and glitters with intellectual Sections.*

And to govern all things, and to order every thing not ordered.

For in the whole World stineth the Triad, *over which the* Monad *rules.*

This Order is the beginning of all Section.

For the Mind of the Father said that all things be cut into Three,

Whose Will assented, and then all things were divided.

For the Mind of the Eternal Father said into Three, governing all things by Mind.

And there appeared in it [the Triad] *Virtue and Wisdom,*

And Multiscient Verity.

This way floweth the shape of the Triad, *being præ-existent.*

Not the first [Essence] *but where they are measured.*

For thou must conceive that all things serve these three Principles.

And immediately after these words, we find the following.

Ἱερὸς πρῶτος δρόμος, ἐν δ' ἄρα μέσῳ
Ἠέριος, τρίτος ἄλλος—

These words are also Translated into *English* by the same hand, but I conceive not duly, and especially as that Translation is pointed; The false pointing perhaps was the fault of the Printer, not of the Learned Author. I would Translate them thus:

The first Course is Sacred, but in the Middle
The Aerial, Another a Third—

And soon after the foregoing words, we find another Passage, under the Title of ΠΑΤΗΡ ΚΑΙ ΝΟΥΣ,

Πάντα γὰρ ἐκτέλεσε πατήρ,
Καὶ νῷ παρέδωκε δευτέρῳ.
Ὃν πρώτου κληΐζεται πᾶν γένος ἀνδρῶν.

Thus in *English*:

For the Father perfected all things, and delivered them over to the second Mind; whom the whole Race of Men calls the first.

For *Orpheus*, though he asserted *One Supreme Deity*, as is owned, yet he hath been

been obſerved to make uſe of *three Names*, viz. *Light*, *Counſel*, and *Life*; and that by theſe three Names of one Deity he affirmed all things to be made. *Clemens Alexandrinus*, (and *Euſebius*, I preſume from him) relates a Verſe of his, relating to the λόγος: And it is this,

Clem. Alexandr. Strom. 5. *Euſeb. Præpar.* l. 13.

Εἰς ἓ λόγον θεῖον βλέψας τούτῳ προσέῤῥᾳε.

In which he adviſeth to a fixed Adherence to this Divine Word.

And that there was in the *Egyptian* Theology ſome kind of Trinity acknowledged, is not only probable from hence, that *Plato* ſeems to have learned his Doctrine thereof from thence, but is proved from a Teſtimony of *Jamblicus*, by a very Learned Countryman of our own, who hath given us the ſame Account of *Parmenides*.

Dr. Cudworth's Intellect. Syſtem. p. 414.

And as to the λόγος, *Clemens Alexandrinus* cites a Paſſage of *Epicharmus*, that does perfectly agree, not only with what I have obſerved before out of *Philo* the *Jew*, but with the New Teſtament alſo. 'Tis this: Ὁ λόγος ἀνθρώπους κυβερνᾷ, That is, *The Word governs the World.*

Strom. V.

But I ſhall next proceed to *Plato*, and conſider what he hath ſaid to my preſent purpoſe: And I make no doubt but it will

appear,

appear, that the *Platonic* Trinity is not any Figment of the Followers of *Plato*, by them falſly aſcribed to him, whatever ſome Men have advanced to ſerve their purpoſe.

This Doctrine of the H. *Trinity* was not plainly revealed to the *Jews*; and therefore it cannot be expected that the *Pagans*, who received ſome Intimations of it from the *Jewiſh Kabbala*, ſhould ſpeak of this Doctrine with that Accuracy and Warineſs that may be expected from a *Chriſtian*. I hope, however, to prove, that *Plato* hath made great Advances towards the *Chriſtian* Verity in this Doctrine: And that the Trinity which *Plato* teacheth is not a Trinity of bare Names, nor a Trinity of Creatures, but of Perſons, who are, neceſſarily ſubſiſting, undeſtroyable, and one God.

Platonis opera per H. Stephan. 1578 cum Serran.

The three *Hypoſtaſes* which *Plato* mentions are τἀγαθὸν, Νοῦς (elſewhere by him called λόγος) and ψυχή.

For the *firſt* of theſe, the τἀγαθὸν, who anſwers to God the Father in the *Chriſtian* Trinity, this is *Plato*'s higheſt *Hypoſtaſis*; of whoſe Divinity there is no diſpute even among the greateſt Adverſaries of the H. Trinity. *'Tis he* (ſays *Plato*) *who gives Truth, and the Power to know it. He is the Author of Science and Truth.* He is

De Repub. l. 6. p. 508.

the

the great Author and Parent of all things; even τῷ θείων, of the most Divine, as he tells us elsewhere. He is God *WHO IS*, the τὸ ὂν ἀεὶ, and the τὸ ὄντως ὄν. He who *EVER* and *TRULY IS*: For thus he elsewhere speaks of God.

Timæus p. 69. C. *Ib.* p. 27 D. *Phædrus* 247. D.

The *second Hypostasis* is Νοῦς, *intellect* or *understanding*, elsewhere expressed by *Plato* by λόγος or Word, of whose Divinity there can be no dispute from the Principles of *Plato*. *Anaxagoras* ascribed to this Νοῦς or Intellect, the making of the World; which *Socrates* approved of. The same is said of the λόγος (as we have seen before) by *Philo* and by the New Testament. And indeed *Plato* elsewhere owns the λόγος the Efficient of the World. For speaking of the World, he adds, ὃν ἔταξε λόγος ὁ πάντων θειότατος ὁρατόν, i. e. *Which the most Divine Word of all rendred Visible.*

Phædo. p. 97. C.

Epinom. p. 986. C.

For the ψυχὴ or *third Hypostasis* of *Plato*, none can doubt of his Belief of the Divinity of that Person. In his Book of *Laws* he undertakes to prove three things, *viz.* The being of a *Numen* (in his Phrase of Gods) or a Deity; that there is a Providence; and that God is not to be drawn from what is right, by Sacrifices. Under the first Head he proves this *Hypostasis* of ψυχὴ: And among other things says, that

De leg. l. 10.

that this ψυχὴ is πρὸ πάντων πρεσβυτάτη and ἀρχὴ κινήσεως, i. e. *More ancient than all things, and the beginning of Motion.* And preſently afterwards he affirms, that this ψυχὴ does ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς, καὶ ἄγειν αὐτὸν, i. e. *Take care of the World and conduct it.*

Ad Dionyſium Ep. 2. And after all, in his Epiſtle to *Dionyſius*, he mentions the Trinity at once; which I leave to the Reader to conſult.

This Trinity of Perſons could never be deviſed by Humane Wit; it could ſerve no Temporal Intereſt. Beſides, it cannot be ſaid to be the Device of *Plato:* It was older than he; and there were in ſundry Times and Countries and Religions (as appears from what hath been ſaid before) ſeveral Intimations of it. As the Promiſe of the *Meſſias* was contained in the *Jewiſh* Books, and yet there was about that time when he appeared a mighty Expectation of the Birth of ſome extraordinary Perſon, in the *Eaſtern* part of the World at leaſt, (as appears from *Suetonius* and *Tacitus* and *Joſephus*, not to ſay *Virgil*) ſo the Trinity, which was revealed (and that but obſcurely) to the *Jews*, yet was in ſome Meaſure from them imparted to the *Gentile* World alſo: From which it is very natural to conclude, that it was θεοδίδακτος θεολογία, a Doctrine delivered by God himſelf.

I

I ſhall repreſent to the Reader the ſerviceableneſs of what hath been ſaid upon this occaſion to our common *Chriſtianity*. IV.

I. It takes off the pretence of Novelty, with which our Doctrine of the H. Trinity is charged by the late *Socinians:* According to this Account this Doctrine is older than *Chriſtianity* it ſelf. And to charge it with being introduced by *Juſtin Martyr*, is againſt all reaſon. If the Doctrine were Novel, I confeſs that might be a very juſt Plea againſt it; and I do not ſee how we could be obliged to receive it. Yet were it but as old as *Chriſtianity* it ſelf, or as the New Teſtament, this would oblige *us* to receive this Doctrine, who profeſs the *Chriſtian* Religion, and own the Books of the New Teſtament. But if it appear to be as old as *Moſes*, and to have been owned by the Ancient *Jews*, and the wiſeſt and moſt inquiſitive of the *Heathen* Writers, this does render it more venerable, at leaſt, and more unexceptionable. And this Doctrine of the H. Trinity being a great bar to the *Jews* receiving the *Chriſtian* Religion (for ſo it is, at leaſt, pretended to be by themſelves) nothing can conduce more

more to their Converſion, than to ſhew that it was the Belief of their Forefathers; and that it is proveable from their own Law: And that was the Inducement that prevailed with me to inſiſt ſo largely on this Matter. Had it not been for *that*, theſe laſt Chapters might have been cenſured as too great a Digreſſion.

II. I add, that this Doctrine of the H. Trinity did make way for the Reception of the *Chriſtian* Religion; eſpecially among thoſe *Gentiles* who were moſt inquiſitive, and of the moſt elevated underſtandings. I ſhall expreſs my ſelf in the words of a very Learned Man, whoſe words are theſe: *Wherefore we cannot but take notice here of a wonderfull Providence of Almighty God, that this Doctrine of a Trinity of Divine* Hypoſtaſes, *ſhould find ſuch Admittance and Entertainment in the* Pagan *World, and be received by the wiſeſt of all their Philoſophers, before the times of* Chriſtianity *amongſt the Learned* Pagans; *which that it proved ſucceſsfull accordingly, is undeniably evident from the Monuments of Antiquity.* That Learned Author obſerves farther, that the junior *Platoniſts*, who continued in their Enmity to *Chriſtianity*, were ſo ſenſible of this, that they adulterated the *Kabbala*, and the genuine

Dr. *Cudworth's* Intellectual Syſtem, *p.* 625.

Do-

Doctrine of their Maſter *Plato*; and in all probability did ſo for this very reaſon; of which that Excellent Perſon gives a fuller Account afterwards.

It may perhaps be ſaid that, whatever Effect this Doctrine might have upon the more Learned *Gentiles*, yet, that it was doubtleſs a Stumbling-block to the *Jews* at that time, and a great bar to their embracing the *Chriſtian* Faith.

I cannot ſee why it ſhould be ſaid to be a Stumbling block to the *Jews* in the firſt times of *Chriſtianity*: I do not find any proof of this. I have elſewhere laid before the Reader the Cauſes and Occaſions of the *Jewiſh* Infidelity. We are not to judge of the *Jews* of *that* time by the *Jews* of *this*. The preſent *Jews* are departed from the Ancient Belief of their Forefathers. It does not follow that becauſe the preſent *Jews* pretend that our Doctrine of the Trinity is a bar to their embracing *Chriſtianity*, that their Foreſathers in the very beginning of *Chriſtianity* laboured under the ſame prejudice. Beſides, if the Doctrine of the Trinity were *not* taught by the *Chriſtian* Religion, the *Jews* wou d not become *Chriſtians*. They *pretend* that to be a Bar; but after all, if that Doctrine were *not* in the New Teſtament, and were diſclaimed by all

all *Chriſtians*, the *Jews* would not however embrace the *Chriſtian* Faith. I find *R. Iſaac* (one of their greateſt Champions) diſputing againſt the Trinity; and this *Jew* denies this Doctrine to be taught in our Goſpels. But though he were of that Opinion, yet we do not find him ever the nearer to the embracing of the *Chriſtian* Religion. The *Socinians* are very vain if they phanſie that our Doctrine of the Trinity is the only Obſtacle that hinders the Converſion of the *Jews*. If it were, yet they who deny this Doctrine to be taught in the Goſpel would ſtill be without Plea. Indeed this is one of their pretences; nor do I know any better way to deal with the *Jews*, than what hath been attempted before, *viz.* to make it appear that this Doctrine was inſinuated in the Old Teſtament, and taught by their Forefathers.

R. Iſaac Chizuk Emun. p. 117.

III. Another Advantage, (and a very conſiderable one it is) is this; that the Account given above is of great uſe, towards the repreſſing the Vanity of thoſe Men who inſolently charge the Doctrine of the H. Trinity with Non-ſenſe and Contradiction, and a mere Impoſition upon our wiſer Faculties. I chooſe to expreſs my ſenſe in the words of the Learned

Au-

Author, whom I have had occasion to mention before; and his words are these: *But besides this Advantage from the Ancient* Pagan Platonists *and* Pythagoreans, *admitting a Trinity into their Theology, in like manner as* Christianity *doth* (*whereby* Christianity *was the more recommended to the* Philosophick Pagans) *there is another Advantage of the same, extending even to this present time, probably not unintended, also, by Divine Providence: That whereas bold and conceited Wits, precipitantly condemning the Doctrine of the* Trinity *for* Non-sense, *absolute* Repugnancy *to Humane Faculties, and* Impossibility, *have thereupon, some of them, quite shaken off* Christianity, *and all* Revealed Religion, *professing only* Theism, *others have frustrated the Design thereof by* Paganizing *it into* Creature-worship *or* Idolatry; *this ignorant and conceited Confidence of both may be retunded and confuted from hence, because the most ingenious and acute of all the* Pagan *Philosophers, the* Platonists *and* Pythagoreans, *who had no byass at all upon them, nor any* Scripture Revelation (*that might seem to impose upon their Faculties*) *but followed the free* Sentiments, *and Dictates of their own Minds, did, notwithstanding, not only entertain this* Trinity *of* Divine Hypostases Eternal and Uncreated,

but were alſo fond of the Hypotheſis, *and made it a main Fundamental of their Theology.*

I do not deny but that ſome Men have given ſuch an Account of the Trinity, as implies a Contradiction; but this is not therefore chargeable upon the Doctrine, as it is delivered in the Scripture, and by the wiſer *Chriſtians*. I do alſo very well know that the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, as taught in the *Roman* Church, is full of Contradiction: Upon which Account, as *Lyra* obſerves, many converted *Jews* have relapſed and returned to their Vomit. But then that Doctrine is not the Doctrine of *Chriſtianity*. It is an eaſie thing for Men to declaim againſt this Doctrine; but to ſhew the Contradiction is impoſſible. Men of the greateſt Wit and Learning, both *Jews* and *Chriſtians*, and *Heathens* alſo, have not been able to ſee the Inconſiſtence of this Doctrine with ſound Reaſon. I ſhall end this particular in the words of the fore-cited Author. His words are theſe: *We ſhall conclude here with Confidence, that the* Chriſtian Trinity, *though there be very much of* Myſtery *in it, yet is there nothing at all of* plain Contradiction *to the undoubted Principles of Humane Reaſon, that is, of* Impoſſibility, *to be found therein, as the* Atheiſts *would pretend; who*

De probat. adv. ent. Chriſti; apud Hieron. de ſanctâ fide.

cry

cry down all for Non-ſenſe *and* abſolute Impoſſibility, *which their dull Stupidity cannot reach to, or their infatuated Minds eaſily comprehend; and therefore, even the Deity it ſelf. And it were to be wiſhed, that ſome* Religioniſts *and* Trinitarians *did not here Symbolize too much with them, in affecting to repreſent the* Myſtery *of the* Chriſtian Trinity *as a thing directly contradictious to all Humane Reaſon and Underſtanding; and that perhaps out of Deſign to make Men ſurrender up themſelves and Conſciences, in a blind and* implicit Faith, *wholly to their Guidance: As alſo to debauch their Underſtandings, by this means, to the ſwallowing down of other* Opinions *of theirs, plainly repugnant to Humane Faculties. As who ſhould ſay, he that believes the* Trinity, (*as we all muſt do, if we will be* Chriſtians) *ſhould boggle at nothing in Religion ever after, nor ſcrupulouſly chew or examine any thing: As if there could be nothing more contradictious or impoſſible to Humane Underſtanding propounded, than this Article of the* Chriſtian Faith.

CHAP. VII.

The CONTENTS.

Of the Time within which the Meſſias *was to come. The* Jews *are uneaſie in this Controverſie. That the Time is paſt. This proved from* Gen. 49. 10. *The Ancient* Jews *own that place to relate to* Meſſias. *That it is very agreeably expounded to that purpoſe. The great care to keep the Tribe of* Juda *diſtinct. They were numbred by themſelves.* Juda *gave denomination to the* Jews. *A Teſtimony from* Abravenel. Benjamin *an acceſſory to this Tribe. The true Religion and Worſhip of God preſerved in it.* Prieſts *and* Levites *preſerved in it. They had alſo Teachers of the Law, and ſome Rulers in our Saviour's Time. A Teſtimony from* R. David Gantz: *Another from* Joſephus. *Out of this Tribe* Meſſias *was to ariſe. That by Scepter* Jacob *does not mean Kingly Power. We do not produce* Gen. 49.10. *as a direct proof that* Jeſus *is the* Chriſt. *The later* Jews *pretenſions againſt the* Chriſtians *Interpretation.* M. Ben-Iſrael's *Attempts. The Reaſon why I do not think fit to conſider them parti-*

particularly. J. Aben Amram *conſidered fully. His Reflections on the* Latin *Verſion, conſidered. His* firſt *conſiderable Expoſition examined, and ſhewed to be inconſiſtent. His* ſecond *conſiderable Opinion, being that of* Abravenel. *The* Jews *have no Juriſdiction or Dominion at this time. Teſtimonies from* Abravenel *and* M. ß. Iſrael *to this purpoſe. That the* Meſſias *was not to be a Temporal Prince. The vain Attempts of the* Jew *upon* עד כי Gen. 49. 10. *That thoſe Particles are not to be ſeparated. The Authority of* Onkelos *conſidered in this matter. That the Expoſition of* Onkelos *does neither hurt the* Chriſtians, *nor help the* Jews. *The pretence that* Jeſus *was not born in the latter Days, as was foretold of the* Meſſias. *The Reader referred for an Anſwer to that pretence in its proper place. The* Jew *leaves his Reader to believe* R. Sueb *and* Abravenel *alſo, if he think fit.*

THE *Jews* are never more uneaſie in their Controverſies with the *Chriſtians*, than when they are preſſed by them with Arguments to convince them that the Time of the Coming of the *Meſſias* is already paſſed. They are in this matter ſo hardly put to it, that they are

forced to their Shifts, to get themſelves clear from thoſe Straits into which they are driven. For as there was a general Expectation of ſome great Perſon, and particularly of the *Meſſias*, in the *Jewiſh* Nation, about that time when *Jeſus* did appear; ſo it is evident from the Writings of the Old Teſtament, and from the other more Ancient Writers of the *Jewiſh* Nation, that the time when *Chriſt* was to come is long ſince elapſed. The *Jews* have been made ſo ſenſible of this, that they have been put to this miſerable Shift, to own that the *Meſſias* was really born about that time when *Chriſtianity* was firſt preached, or about the time of the Deſtruction of the Temple by the *Romans*. This is ſo lewd an Affirmation, that to name it is Confutation enough. And to do the *Jews* right, it is no *Catholick* Opinion amongſt them. The Wiſe among them will not adhere to it. The *Jews* indeed have ſomething to ſay in this matter which better deſerves to be conſidered: Their pretences which are moſt conſiderable are theſe two:

V. Manſſeri Diſputat. de Meſſiâ cum Judæo Baſil. A. D. 1639.

Firſt, They pretend that the time of the Coming of the *Meſſias* is not *fixed* and *certain*, but conditional, and therefore *alterable*. They ſay the time of his Coming depends upon their Repentance: For Re-

Repentance, they ſay, is neceſſary to prepare Men for the receiving of the *Meſſias*; and this hath always been the Senſe of their VViſe Men: Hence we find it ſaid amongſt them, that if *Iſrael* would *repent one Day, their Redeemer would forth with come.* And again, *That the* Meſſias *ſhall come if they deſerve well; if they do not he ſhall not come.* *Bechai in Legem*, fol. 160. col 4. *Menaſſ. B. Iſrael de Reſur. l. 3. c. 3.*

Secondly, The *Jews* affirm (and we cannot deny the Truth of that Aſſertion) that the *Meſſias* was to come in the *laſt Days.* By the *laſt Days*, in the Style of the Old Teſtament, is meant the *Days* of the *Meſſias. Menaſſeh B. Iſrael* tells us, that *R. Moſes Gerundenſis* affirms, that wherever it is ſaid *in the laſt Days*, thoſe words are to be underſtood of the *Days* of the *Meſſias.* Hereupon the *Jews* take the liberty to put off the Coming of the *Meſſias* till the End of the World: And they do affirm that *Jeſus* cannot be the *Meſſias*, becauſe he did not come in thoſe Days which by the Prophets had been called *the laſt Days*; by which they will needs underſtand the End of the World: Whereas it is almoſt 1700 Years ſince our *Jeſus* appeared; which is too great a Diſtance from the End of the World to be called *the laſt Days.* *M. B. Iſrael de Reſur. l. 3. c. 3.* *R. Iſaac Chizuk Emun. c 1.*

For the more orderly proceeding in this weighty Matter, I ſhall,

Firſt, Prove that the *Meſſias* is already come; or, which amounts to it, that the time in which God promiſed to ſend the *Meſſias* is paſt; and this I ſhall prove from the Text of the H. Scripture.

Secondly, I ſhall prove that the Promiſe of the *Meſſias* was an Abſolute, and not a Conditional Promiſe.

Thirdly, That allowing *the laſt Days* to denote the Days of the *Meſſias*, that this is no Objection againſt *Jeſus*, whoſe Coming was in *theſe laſt Days*.

I. That the *Meſſias* is already come; or, which amounts to it, that the time within which God promiſed to ſend the *Meſſias* is paſt. This I ſhall prove from ſeveral places of Scripture.

Firſt, From the words of *Jacob*; *The Scepter ſhall not depart from* Judah, *nor a Lawgiver from between his Feet, untill* Shiloh *come*; *and unto him ſhall the gathering of the People be*, Gen. 49. 10. That theſe words do contain a Promiſe of the *Meſſias*, all *Chriſtians* affirm; and ſo do very many *Jews*. The *Jews* that are moſt Ancient, eſpecially acknowledge this; they

they having not learned the many Arts which the latter *Jews* have found out to elude the force of theſe words, and reporting truly the ſenſe of their Ancient VViſe Men in this Matter. For the better apprehending the ſenſe of theſe words, it is to be remembred, that the firſt Promiſe of the *Meſſias* was made to *Adam*, as the *Seed* of the *Woman* that ſhould break the *Serpent's Head*. Thence it was derived to *Shem* the Son of *Noah*; *Japhet* and *Ham* being paſſed by. Hence it was deduced to *Abraham*; the other Sons of *Terah* not being conſidered. From *Abraham*, his Son *Iſhmael* being paſſed by, it is tranſmitted unto *Iſaac*. This bleſſing of *Abraham*, as 'tis called, is from *Iſaac*, *Eſau* being paſſed by, conveighed to *Jacob*: Here it now reſts; and we find *Jacob* near his Death, and calling his Sons together, and telling them what ſhould happen to them in *the laſt Days*. And here he predicts the Coming of the *Meſſias*, and tells us within what ſpace of time he ſhould come, what ſhould follow upon his Coming; and this *Jacob* does when he comes to foretell what ſhould happen to the Poſterity of *Judah*, from whom the *Meſſias* was to be born. *The Scepter* --- i. e. The Poſterity of *Judah* (from whom the *Jews*, eſpecially after the

Gen. 3.15. ch. 9. 26, 27.

Gen. 12.3, Gen. 22.18. with ch. 17. 19. Gen. 28.4.

the Captivity of *Babylon*, were denominated) shall not cease to be a distinct Tribe and Polity, professing their own Laws and enjoying the Teachers of it, till *Shiloh* (who is *Messias*, according to the Ancient *Jews* themselves) shall come; and to him the *Gentiles* shall be obedient. So that the *Messias* was to come before the Destruction and Dispersion of that People. From whence it is evident that he is come already.

All things do admirably agree, both for the confirming of that sense which I have given of these words, and the applying them also to our *Jesus*. I shall not, however, touch upon the many particulars which might upon this occasion be insisted upon.

Thus much is evident, that in the words of *Jacob* which relate to *Judah*, something that is very *peculiar* and very *great* is predicted concerning his Posterity or Tribe. Indeed *Philo* the *Jew* lays a great stress upon all the words of *Jacob* which we find in this Chapter. He tells us that these words speak him to be a Prophet, and divinely inspired. He says that it does from other things appear that *Jacob* was a *Prophet*; but more especially from these words of his in this Chapter. He says that those words of his, *Gather your selves toge-*

V. Philo p. 404. *E.*

Philo *Quis rerum divin hæres?*

together, that I may tell you that which ſhall befall you in the laſt Days בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים, i. e. They were *an Oracle of a Perſon divinely inſpired.* But his words of *Judah* do more particularly ſpeak this Inſpiration, and the Divine Benediction alſo: For theſe words contain this Benediction, *v.* 28. And whereas *Reuben* and *Simeon* and *Levi* have ſomething ſaid of them that inſinuates their *Fault* and their *Diminution*; *Judah* hath nothing of this; but inſtead of it many things which imply the Privilege of that Tribe.

And indeed there was ſomething *peculiar* to that Tribe: I ſay peculiar, not only with reſpect to thoſe mentioned before, but alſo with reſpect to them who follow. This appears from the Hiſtory of After-times. For when the other Ten Tribes, after the Death of *Solomon*, departed from the appointed Worſhip of God, this Tribe continued therein. And whereas 2 Kin. 18 9.
the Ten Tribes were carried away Captive in the Days of *Hoſea* King of *Iſrael*, *Judah* remained in his own Land. The other Tribes were carried away, the Diſtinction of their Tribes and Families was loſt, and they return'd no more to their own Country. On the other hand, *Judah* did not loſe his Tribe, but continued a *ſeparate* and diſtinct People, both *before*

שבט *fore* and *under*, and *after* the *Captivity* of *Babylon*. The *Scepter* or *Tribe* (for ſo
Gen. 49. 10, 16, 28. the *Hebrew* word ſignifies in this Chapter eſpecially) did not depart from *Judah*: It was ſo far from it, that there was ſpecial Care taken to preſerve *Judah* diſtinct in its *Tribe* and Families; the Conſervation whereof is predicted in theſe words of *Jacob*.

We find even in the time of *Saul*, that the Men of *Judah* were numbred apart, and not put into the groſs Number of the
1 Sam. 11. 8. Men of *Iſrael*. *When he numbred them in* Beſek, *the Children of* Iſrael *were three hundred Thouſand, and the Men of* Judah *thirty Thouſand*. Again, in *David*'s time
2 Sam. 24. it was ſo; Joab *gave up the Summ of the Number of the People unto the King: and there were in* Iſrael *eight hundred Thouſand valiant Men that drew the Sword; and the Men of* Judah *were five hundred thouſand Men*. Such care was taken to preſerve this Tribe diſtinct, that when the Kingdom was ſetled in the Family of *David*, there was a Prophet alſo to take care of the Genealogies of that Tribe. Thus we
2 Chro. 12. 15. with ch. 13. 22. read of the *Book* of *Iddo the Seer concerning Genealogies*, in the Story of *Rehoboam*; and of his *Story* or *Commentary* in that of *Abijah*. That this care was not wanting during the Captivity of *Babylon*, appears

appears abundantly from the firſt Book of *Chronicles*, the Book of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, and from *Joſephus*. For tho' there were doubt of the Genealogy of ſome others (*Neh.* 7. 64. with *Ezra* 2. 62.) yet 'tis evident that the Tribe of *Judah* preſerved it ſelf diſtinct: And indeed this care was not wanting to the Days of *Auguſtus*, in whoſe Time our *Jeſus* was born. *Auguſtus* ſet forth a Decree for the *Enrolling* thoſe which were ſubjected to the *Roman* Power. Upon that occaſion *Joſeph* comes to *Bethlehem*, becauſe he was of the Houſe and Lineage of *David*. And this Enrolling or Taxing *Joſephus* alſo mentions, as that which happened in the Time of *Cyrenius*, as St. *Luke* relates it. And therefore well might *Juſtin Martyr* appeal to the *Romans* for the truth of what he affirmed, when he tells them, that *Jeſus* was born in *Bethlehem*, ὡς καὶ μαθεῖν δύνασθε ἐκ τῶν ἀπογραφῶν τῶν γενομένων ὅτι Κυρηνίου, τοῦ ὑμετέρου ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ πρώτου γενομένου ἐπιτρόπου, i. e. *As* (ſays he) *ye may learn from the Rolls which were made under* Cyrenius, *your firſt Procurator in* Judea.

Joſeph. Antiquit. Lib. c. 4.

Luke 2. 1, 2, 3, 4.

Joſeph. Antiq. l. 18. c. 1.

J. Martyr. Apol. 11.

V. Tertullian. contra Marcionem l. 4.

I cannot but take notice of a Paſſage in *Abravenel*, that comes up to my preſent purpoſe. That *Jew* is diſcourſing of the Excellencies of this Tribe of *Judah* above

Abravanel in Prophetas Priores. Lipſ. fol. 95. & fol. 100.

above the reſt. As Proofs of this, he mentions the Order of *Judah*'s Encampment, and that he was choſen to go firſt to Battel: He adds, that when the People was numbred, *Judah* was always numbred by it ſelf, and not as an Acceſſory to the other Tribes, of which Matter I have ſpoken before: He reckons up the Places where this is mentioned in the H. Writ. He ſays, that whereas the other Tribes were conjoined and numbred in the groſs, this Tribe was, for its Excellency, numbred diſtinctly יהוה ענין לא יסור וכו׳. This is the meaning of thoſe words (*Gen.* 49. 10.) The *Scepter* (or Tribe) *ſhall not depart from* Judah, *&c.* He adds, that whereas the other Tribes were carried away out of their Land, this Tribe continued there; and that even when it was in Captivity, it retained ſome Sovereignty, and a Lawgiver or Teacher of Righteouſneſs; and *that* it would do to the Coming of our *Meſſias*. We find him alſo diſcourſing in another place to my preſent purpoſe, very agreeably to what I have ſaid before.

Thus were the Poſterity of *Judah* preſerved diſtinct and ſeparate, when the other Tribes were, upon the Matter, loſt. As for *Benjamin*, who adhered to *Judah* in the true Worſhip of God, when the other

other Tribes fell off, and continued with that Tribe alſo, it is to be conſidered that it was reputed but an Acceſſion or *Appendix* to *Judah*; and whatever Privilege it preſerved, it was upon that Account; *viz.* as it adhered to *Judah*. And we find *Judah* and *Benjamin* together called *one Tribe*, three ſeveral times in one Chapter. And afterwards, when mention is made of the Captivity of the *ten Tribes*, it is ſaid, *the Lord was very angry with* Iſrael, *and removed them out of his ſight*: There was none left *but the Tribe of* Judah *only*. And we find that after the Schiſm, the very Cities of *Benjamin* are called the Cities of *Judah*. And not only ſo, but the Men of *Benjamin* were reputed, after the Schiſm, the Men of *Judah*. So that upon the matter, this Tribe of *Benjamin* was but an Acceſſion to that of *Judah*: And *Judah* gave denomination to all the *Jews*, after the Captivity of *Babylon*. And this *Juſtin Martyr* takes notice of; Ἰούδας γὰρ πατὴρ Ἰουδαίων, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὸ Ἰουδαῖοι καλεῖσθαι ἔσχηκαν· i. e. Judah *was the Anceſtor of the* Jews; *and from him it was that they were called* Jews. And to this purpoſe we have a remarkable place in the Book of *Eſther*: The words are theſe. *In* Shuſhan *the Palace there was a certain* Jew, *whoſe Name was* Mordecai, *the Son of* Jair, *the Son of* Shimei,

1 Kings 11. 13. 32. 36. 2 King. 17. 18.

2 Chro. 11. 5, 10. with ch. 17. v. 9. 2 Chro. 14. 4, 8, 12. ch. 20. 3, 4, 5, 13, 15.

Apol. 11.

Eſth. 2. 5.

איש ישמעי Shimei, *the Son of* Kiſh *a* Benjamite. The ſame Man is ſaid to be a *Judite* or one belonging to *Judah*, and a *Benjamite*.

But as the *Tribe* continued after the *ten Tribes* were diſperſed, ſo did the Doctors and Teachers of the Law (which is here meant by what we render *Lawgiver*) continue in this Tribe of *Judah*, when they were not among the other Tribes. And this is another remarkable Privilege of *Judah*, which *Jacob* predicts in theſe words; *Nor a Law-giver from between his Feet.* Tis very well known that God appointed an Order of Men to miniſter in holy things, and inſtruct his People; namely, the Sons of *Aaron* and the *Levites*. The *Levites* were diſperſed about the Tribes for this End: This benefit was common to all the Tribes, till the Schiſm in the Time of *Jeroboam*; after that it was peculiar to *Judah*, and continued ſo till the Deſtruction of the ſecond Temple. To this purpoſe we read in the Days of *Reboboam*, that *the* Prieſts *and the* Levites *that were in all* Iſrael *reſorted to him out of all their Coaſts. For the* Levites *left their Suburbs and their Poſſeſſion, and came to* Judah *and* Jeruſalem: *For* Jeroboam *and his Sons had caſt them off from executing the Prieſt's Office unto the Lord.* And to this purpoſe *Abijah* ſpeaks to *Jeroboam* and

2 Chro. 11. 13, 14.

and all *Iſrael*. *Have ye not* (ſays he) *caſt out the Prieſts of the Lord, the Sons of* Aaron, *and the* Levites, *and have made you Prieſts after the Manner of the Nations of other Lands? So that whoſoever cometh to conſecrate himſelf with a young Bullock, and ſeven Rams, the ſame may be a Prieſt of them that are no Gods. But as for us, the Lord is our God, and we have not forſaken him; and the Prieſts which miniſter unto the Lord are the Sons of* Aaron, *and the* Levites *wait upon their Buſineſs.* Nor did this *Law-giver* or Teacher of the Law depart from *Judah*, till the final Deſtruction of the *Jews* by the *Romans*. The Religious Kings of *Judah* took care for the Inſtruction of that People. Thus did *Jehoſaphat*; *he ſent to his Princes to teach in the Cities of* JUDAH, *and with them he ſent* Levites--- and they taught in JUDAH, *and had the Book of the Law of the Lord with them, and went about through all the Cities of* JUDAH, *and taught the People.* *Hezekiah* alſo calls the *Levites* to their Duty; and *Joſiah* takes care for the Inſtruction of all the Men of *JUDAH*. Thus it was to the Captivity; *Judah* had the Inſtructers and Teachers of the Law, and that Tribe, upon that Conſideration, was prone to be puffed up. *How do ye ſay we are wiſe* (ſays *Jeremy* to them)

2 Chro 13 4, 9, 10.

2 Chro. 17. 7, 8, 9.

2 Chro. 29. 5, 30. 2 Chron. 34. 30.

and the Law of the Lord is with us? Thus it was alſo in the Captivity of *Babylon*; the Doctors of the Law did not depart from this Tribe: *Ezekiel*, both a Prieſt and a Prophet, was there with them; there was *Daniel*; there were both *Prieſts* and *Levites*: There they continued during this Captivity; and we have a particular Account of their Return from thence. So that the *Law-giver*, even during that Captivity, did not *depart from* the *Feet* of *Judah*. After this, we have abundant Evidence that they continued in *Judah*, and had upon them the Charge of inſtructing the People in the Law of *Moſes*. And in our Saviour's Time we have in the Goſpels frequent mention of *Prieſts* and *Levites*, of *Scribes* or *Doctors* of the Law. *The Scribes and Phariſees ſit in* Moſes's *Chair*, ſays *Jeſus*. And St. *Paul* tells us he was brought up in *Jeruſalem* at the Feet of *Gamaliel*. This *Gamaliel* was a Famous Doctor of the Law, the Son of that *Simeon* who took *Jeſus* into his Arms; and that *Simeon* was the Son of *Hillel*, a moſt eminent Doctor of the Law, and a great Founder of a School in *Judah*.

Ezek. 1.3.
Ezr. 2.36, 40. with Neh. 8.9. & *ch.* 12
Mal. 2.7. *ch.* 4.4.
Mat. 23.2.
Acts 22.3.

By a *Law-giver*, in the words of *Jacob*, is not meant any Perſon or Perſons who have a Legiſlative Power, or a Power of making Laws, but only thoſe who were the

the Doctors and *Teachers* of thoſe Statutes and Ordinances that were made to their hand. Theſe Men had not *Power* to make new Laws; they only expounded them that were made. And the *Jews* ought not to refuſe this interpretation of the word, both becauſe it is in it ſelf unexceptionable, and beſides that, it is their own. *Onkelos* renders it by *Scribe*; and for the *Jeruſalem Targum* and that of *Jonathan*, they do expreſly expound it by *Doctors* and *Teachers of the Law*. And we have very frequent mention of ſuch *Scribes*, *Lawyers*, and *Teachers of the Law*, in the Goſpels. And that ſuch Teachers of the Law were among the *Jews* till the Deſtruction of the Nation, is not queſtioned by *Jews* or *Chriſtians*. ספרא

I am very ſenſible that the word שבט (*Gen.* 49. 10.) which we tranſlate *Scepter* is by the LXXII *Greek* Interpreters rendred by Αρχων, i. e. a *Ruler* or *Governour*. And I do very well know the ill uſe which ſome *Chriſtians* have made of that rendring. I will not here ſo far digreſs as to ſhow how unreaſonably they have, on that occaſion, been miſled. Let the Tranſlation be admitted, our Cauſe againſt the *Jews* will not ſuffer by it. For certain it is the *Jews* had Rulers of their own, even then when they were under

the *Roman* Yoke. And even in this ſence the place does make againſt the *Jews*. When they had a *Roman* Preſident they had "Αρχοντες or *Rulers* of their own. Theſe they had in our Saviour's Time; the "Αρχων was not then departed from *Judah*. We have abundant proof of this. We find
Mat. 9 18. with Luk. 8. 41. a Ruler applying to *Jeſus* in behalf of his Daughter. And that he was a *Jew*, we
Luk. 14 1. 18. 18. 23 13. 24. 20. may learn from a Parallel place, where he is named and called *a Ruler of the Synagogue*. Elſewhere we find that *Jeſus* went into the Houſe of one of the *chief Phariſees*. We render it, indeed, *chief Phariſees*; but it is in the *Greek* τῶν ἀρχόντων τῶν φαρισαίων i. e. he was one of the *Rulers* of the *Phariſees*. It is plain that he was a *Jew*, and a Ruler among them. We read of another who was certainly a *Jew* alſo. We read elſewhere of the *chief*
John 26. 7. *Prieſts* and *Rulers*; and they were unqueſtionably *Rulers* over the *Jews*. And theſe *Jewiſh Rulers* are elſewhere ſaid to have delivered *Jeſus* to be condemned to
3. 1. death, and to have *crucified* him. *Nicodemus* is expreſly ſaid to be a *Ruler of the*
12. 42. *Jews*: And it appears from another place, that there were divers of theſe Rulers among the *Jews*; and many of theſe Ru-
Acts 4 8. 13. 27. 14. 5. lers are ſaid to have believed on *Jeſus*. Before theſe Rulers of the People *Peter* makes his

his Defence. Theſe Rulers are ſaid to have condemned *Jeſus*, and to have perſecuted his Followers. So that if the words of *Jacob* were to be read thus, *a Ruler ſhall not depart from* Judah, there would be no danger in the *Chriſtians* admitting it, from the *Jews*. But though what I ſaid laſt is ſufficient to ſatisfie any *Chriſtian* in this Matter, yet I muſt remember that I have to do with the *Jews*, who will not think themſelves concluded by Proofs from the N. Teſtament.

And therefore I proceed to the Teſtimony of a *Jewiſh* Writer on this Subject. I mean *R. David Gantz*, who tells us that it was the Cuſtom at *Jeruſalem*, that tho' the Kingdom were in the *Haſmonæans*, and afterwards in *Herod* and his Family, yet the *Naſi* or Prince was always of the Family of *David*. And though the King with his Army took care of Matters of State, yet Matters of the Law or of Religion were always managed by the High-Prieſt, and this *Naſi*. He tells us that *Herod*, after ſome time of his bad Reign, conſtituted *Hillel* and his Sons Princes or Rulers of the Houſe of *David*. And if this be ſo, the *Scepter* was not departed from *Judah*, even then when the *Kingdom* was departed; which is a Matter of great importance in this Subject which

Tzemah David per Vorſtium. L. B. 1644. pag. 84. & 86.

I am now upon: I may afterward have a fair occaſion to reſume this Matter. I ſhall now only add to what I have ſaid upon this occaſion, the Teſtimony of two other *Jews* in this Matter. *Joſephus* gives account of the *Jews* after their return from *Babylon*. He tells us they had Rulers among them; and he names them that were Ἀρχοντες or Rulers; among which he reckons *Salathiel*, of the Family of *David*. And *Aben Amram* allows that there were *Præſidentes ex Juda*, or Rulers of *Judah* even in the time of *Jeſus*.

Joſeph. Antiq. l. 11. c. 4.

n. 591.

Another Privilege peculiar to this Tribe of *Judah*, and indeed the greateſt, was that the *Meſſias* was to be born of it. This the *Jews* grant, and do expect a *Meſſias* the Son of *David*; and conſequently, of the Tribe of *Judah*. That by *Shiloh* here is meant the *Meſſias*, many of the *Jews* grant. And that this Privilege ſhould be altogether omitted by *Jacob*, is by no means credible. If it be mentioned at all, it muſt be in theſe words of *Jacob*, which ſpeak of the coming of *Shiloh*. And that a thing of this importance is not omitted, will be evident to him that conſiders with due Application. *Jacob* promiſeth to tell his Sons what ſhall *befall them in the laſt Days*. That expreſſion the *Jews* are wont to apply to the Days of the *Meſſias*. *Jacob*

Gen 49. 1.

cob does foretell what would happen to the ſeveral Tribes; and the Event was agreeable to his Prediction, and is the beſt Interpreter of his words. We ſhall find many things predicted that are very minute in compariſon with the Birth of the *Meſſias*. But whatever thoſe things were in themſelves, they were punctually fulfilled; and he that will compare the words of *Jacob* with other Scriptures, which relate the Events in which his Predictions were fulfilled, will be convinced of it. If he ſay of *Reuben*, *Thou ſhalt not excel* (Gen. 49. 4.) ſee it fulfilled afterward (*Judg.* 5. 15, 16.) If he foretell the diſperſion of *Simeon* and *Levi* (*v.* 7.) it was exactly accompliſhed in them both (*Joſh.* 19. 1, 9. with 1 *Chron.* 4. 39.) What he ſays of the Situation of *Zebulun* (*v.* 13.) was fulfilled (*Joſh.* 19. 10, *&c.* with *Deut.* 33. 18.) What he ſays of *Dan* (v. 17.) was verified in *Samſon*, of that Tribe (*Judges* ch. 14. 15, 16.) The oppreſſion of the Poſterity of *Gad*, and their Victory after this, are plainly predicted by *Jacob* (Gen. 49. 19.) and they are as evidently fulfilled afterwards, (*Judg.* 10. 7, 8, with 1 *Chron.* 5. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22.) For what he ſays of *Aſher* and *Napthali* (v. 20, 21.) See what Account we have of theſe things afterwards, (*Deut.* 33. 24. *Judges* ch. 4.

and *ch.* 5. v. 18.) The Fruitfulneſs of the Poſterity of *Joſeph* predicted (*v.* 22.) was eminently fulfilled (*Numb.* 1. 33, 35. *Joſh.* 17. 14 15,16,17, with *Deut.* 33.17.) And when he calls *Benjamin a ravening Wolf* (v. 27.) the Off-ſpring of *Benjamin* made good the Character (*Judges* ch. 20, and ch. 21. *Eſther* ch. 2. *v.* 5. and ch. 9. with *Judges* 3. 15.) Nay here are other things ſaid of *Judah*, with reſpect to the Power which his Poſterity ſhould arrive to, and the Fruitfulneſs of his Country (*v.* 9, 11, 12.) which received an evident Accomplithment (2 *Sam.* 2. 4. with *Numb.* 13. 22, 23, compared with other Forms of Speech uſed in Scripture; (*Deut.* 33. 14. *Job* 29. 6.) And do we think the Birth of *Meſſias*, which was promiſed to the *Firſt man*, and conveighed down to *Jacob*, is omitted here?

Shevet Jehuda pro Gentium, p. 26. Menaſſeh B. Iſrael quæſt. 65. in Gen.

I know very well that the later *Jews* have, with all their skill, endeavoured to avoid the force of this place. And *Menaſſeh Ben-Iſrael* hath found out no leſs than eleven ſeveral ways of expounding theſe words of *Jacob*. Some of theſe are tranſparent, nothing but *Trick* and *Subterfuge*; the reſt groundleſs; and none of them able to bear up againſt what hath been ſaid before.

Before

Before I proceed to examine the *Jews* pretences againſt the *Chriſtian's* Expoſition of this place, I ſhall premiſe that the *Chriſtians* are not altogether to be excuſed. I do not think my ſelf obliged to defend them when they have not proceeded upon ſound Principles.

It is certain that thoſe who have affirmed that by *Scepter Jacob* means Kingly Power, and that he hath a reſpect to the Kingdom of *David*, and his Family, are in a groſs Errour, and will never be able to defend this Place againſt the *Jews*. Theſe Men betray the *Chriſtian* Cauſe, and give the *Jews* the greateſt Advantage againſt it. This Kingdom did not commence till above 600 Years after *Jacob* ſpake theſe words; and was intirely expired above 500 Years before *Jeſus* was born. If this were meant by *Scepter*, it was above 600 Years before it came into the hands of *Judah*, continued but 500 and odd Years, and was removed before the coming of the *Meſſias* about 500 Years. *David* was the firſt King, *Zedekiah* the laſt. After this 'twas in the *Aſmonæan* hands, that were of another Tribe; and then in the hands of *Herod*, who was an Alien. There is no ſhadow for this Opinion, that is worth the taking notice of. The *Jews* are glad of this Advantage; and

and there is hardly any thing that they more inſultingly throw in our Teeth than this very inconſiſtent Opinion. The truth of it is, this is not maintainable by any means. It is loaded with inſuperable difficulties. We affirm what we can never prove, and what the *Jews* can diſprove with the greateſt eaſe imaginable.

The Author of one of the *Nizachons* tells us how the *Chriſtians* expound this place, *viz.* of *Jeſus*; and that they affirm, that upon his coming the Kingdom of *Judah* ſhould ceaſe. *But* (ſays he) *this Kingdom ceaſed long before* Jeſus *was born*; *namely, from the time of* Zedekiah. This is alſo objected to the *Chriſtians* by *Aben Amram*, and by *R. Iſaac*, to name no more; and ſo far the *Jews* muſt be allowed to be in the right, and the *Chriſtians* in the wrong. But then this is not to be imputed to all *Chriſtians*, but to ſome only.

Nizachon vetus, p. 29. n. 585. *Chizuk Emunah* p. 137.

It is to be conſidered in the next place, that we do not produce *Gen.* 49. 10. againſt the *Jews*, as a direct Proof that our *Jeſus* is the *Chriſt*. No, we are far from it. We produce it as a Proof that, whereas they ſay *Meſſias* is not yet come, the time in which he was to come is long ſince elapſed; and that he was to come before the final Deſtruction of the *Jewiſh* Polity

Polity and State. We have other unexceptionable Proofs that *Jeſus* is the *Chriſt*. So that the main Cauſe does not depend upon this place. And we readily grant, that though it be evident that *Jeſus* was born within that time predicted here, in which the *Meſſias* was to come, yet we are not ſo vain as to infer from thence that he is the *Chriſt*. Thus much however is certain, that whoever ſhall, now the time is elapſed, pretend to be the *Meſſias*, will be juſtly eſteemed an Impoſtor, becauſe he does not come in the appointed time. For though we do not conclude *Jeſus* to be the *Chriſt* becauſe he was of the Family of *David*; yet on the other hand, we do juſtly conclude that he who is not of that Tribe, ought not to be received as the true *Meſſias*. And that whoever ſhall hereafter ſet up for a *Meſſias*, ought not to be received, becauſe the *Scepter* is already departed from *Judah*.

I ſhall now proceed to conſider the *Jews* pretenſions againſt what hath been ſaid before. I will not trouble my ſelf or Reader with what *Menaſſeh Ben-Iſrael* hath advanced to elude the force of this Teſtimony; becauſe it hath been anſwered already by ſundry of our Learned Writers; and alſo becauſe much of what he hath ſaid is ſo vain and trifling, that I do not think

think it worth mine or the Readers while to inſiſt upon it. But yet what he hath ſaid of Moment ſhall not be paſſed by.

I will rather chooſe to conſider what *Aben Amram* hath ſaid on this occaſion; he having conſidered what *M. B. Iſrael* had ſaid before him, and inſiſting upon what he judged to have been ſaid by him of the greateſt Weight and Moment. Beſides, I take him to be far the greateſt Man, that this Age hath produced, of the *Jewiſh* People, and the ſharpeſt and moſt conſiderable Enemy to *Chriſtianity*. He hath diſcourſed of this place, not occaſionally, but ſeparately, and out of deſign to wreſt it out of the hands of *Chriſtians:* And we may be ſure he hath exerted his utmoſt force and wit that he might effect it.

I ſhall follow him in his own Method, and endeavour to anſwer all that he hath to ſay in this Matter. And this I the rather chooſe to do, not only becauſe *M. B. Iſrael* hath been anſwered by other hands, but becauſe I think *Aben Amram* ſays more than any *Jew* that I have yet ſeen, either in Print or *MS.*

J. Aben Amram Porta veritatis MS. p. 585.

He repeats the Text as it is in the *Latin* Tranſlation of St. *Hieronymus*. He owns the place to be meant of the *Meſſias*, as the *Chaldee* Paraphraſt does expound

pound it, *Et eſt apud nos recepta ſententia*; i. e. he owns this to be the received Opinion among the *Jews*. This is frankly and honeſtly ſaid; though if he had not granted it we could have proved it abundantly. But ſo far I find we are agreed. But then he proceeds to ſhew how the *Chriſtians* argue from hence, *viz.* Thus. Since the *Kingly Scepter* is departed, *Meſſias* muſt be come: None appeared but *Jeſus*; therefore is he the *Meſſias*. Thus untruly does he repreſent the *Chriſtian*'s Argument. Some weak *Chriſtians* perhaps might have ſaid ſomething like it: But no wiſe *Chriſtian* could ever argue after that Manner. What we argue is, that if the *Scepter* be departed, *Meſſias* muſt needs be come. But this is not all. He found in the *Latin* Verſion the word *Sceptrum*; and he, out of his own Brain, puts *Regium* to it, in the *Chriſtian*'s Argument that he repreſents him to draw from this Text. He does unfairly all this while: He makes the *Chriſtian* ſpeak what he pleaſeth; and then, in one of his following Numbers, he falls foul upon him. The obſerving this is a ſufficient and full Anſwer to what he there ſays upon this occaſion. n. 591.

He next falls foul upon the *Latin* Verſion: And firſt, becauſe *Shebet* is rendred *Sceptrum*.

Sceptrum. For though it ſometimes (he grants) ſignifies *Dominion* or *Empire*, yet it does not always ſignifie *Regal* Dominion. And we ſay ſo too; and more, that it does not ſignifie Kingly Dominion in this Place; nor is it by the *Latin* rendred ſo. He might therefore have ſpared himſelf this labour. He ſays the word hath other ſignifications in H. Writ, and quotes *M. B. Iſrael* to prove it. But the *Jew* might have ſpared himſelf this trouble; for we *Chriſtians* do grant and are far from denying it: Nor do we ſee any kind of danger in all this.

He goes on, and ſays it is ſtill a greater fault, that the word מחוקק ſhould be rendred by *Dux*. For, he ſays, the word ſignifies one that makes Conſtitutions, or a *Scribe*; as the *Chaldee* hath it: That it is rendred by the *Latin*, elſewhere, by *Doctor*; and he asks *why it is not ſo rendred here?* I am content, for my part, it ſhould be rendred *Doctor* or *Scribe*; if that will content the *Jew*, I am ſure it will do the *Chriſtian* Cauſe no hurt.

But the moſt grievous fault of all in the *Latin* Verſion (he ſays) is this; that what we render, *And unto him ſhall the gathering of the People be*, is in the *Latin*, *Et ipſe erit expectatio Gentium*. For (ſays he) in the *Hebrew* it is יִקְהַת, which is as much

much as *Congregatio*; and therefore it ought to be *to him*, and not *He*. And then he would not have it *Gentium*, but *Populorum*. I am not bound to defend the *Latin*; though I think he hath not ſo much Cauſe to complain of it as he pretends. But I will not differ with him about it. Our *Engliſh*, even in this laſt Clauſe, which he finds the greateſt fault with, is exactly as he would have it. And for my part, I am ſo well ſatisfied in the Queſtion diſputed between us, that as I would not lay hold upon little uncertain Criticiſms to uphold my Cauſe, ſo I am ready to grant the *Jew* what Advantage he can poſſibly make of them.

Theſe things the *Jew* premiſeth; he after this begins his Aſſault with all his force. And firſt he tells us how the words may be turn'd into *Latin* from the *Hebrew*: And in that Verſion, inſtead of *Sceptrum*, he puts in *Virga*, as that word ſignifies a *Rod* for Correction or Caſtigation. He ſays the Text is diverſly interpreted by the *Jews*: And refers us again to *Menaſſeh Ben Iſrael*; who hath indeed laid before his Reader a very great Variety of Interpretations. But he is ſo wary as only to inſiſt upon two of them, as moſt conſiderable. I will follow him; and examine whether they be conſiderable or not.

not. If it ſhould at laſt appear that theſe are not conſiderable, the Reader will eaſily believe that the other Interpretations in *Menaſſeh Ben Iſrael*, which I thought fit to paſs by, are very inconſiderable; and conſequently, if I can anſwer theſe two conſiderable Interpretations in *Menaſſeh Ben Iſrael*, I may be preſumed to have anſwered all that is conſiderable in him.

I. I begin with his *firſt* conſiderable Opinion which he finds in *Menaſſeh B Iſrael*: And that is the Opinion of *R. Ben Sueb*, whoſe interpretation of the words is this: *Non deficiet Virga* [afflictio] *Judæis, nec adverſarii ſtatuentes contra Judæos, donec veniat Meſſias*, i. e. *the Rod* (ſc. of affliction) *ſhall not ceaſe from the* Jews, *nor Enemies decreeing againſt them, till* Meſſias *come*, &c. Or, ſuppoſing this Expoſition, *Nec ſcriba inter pedes ejus* (according to *Abravenel*) i.e. *Nor a Scribe from between his Feet*, i.e. *Wiſe men* that ſhall teach them the Law of God in their affliction. According to what we read *Pſ.* 44. v. 17. *All this is come upon us; yet have we not forgotten thee, neither have we dealt falſly in thy Covenant.* He adds, that this Expoſition does not claſh with what we read, *Gen.* 49. 28. where *Jacob* is

ſaid

ſaid to have bleſſed the twelve Tribes. For (ſays he) it was *Jacob*'s intention to ſhew the End of their Afflictions, *viz.* when the *Meſſias* came; nor did he call his Sons together only to bleſs them, but to predict what ſhould afterwards happen to them. This is the moſt I can make of this conſiderable Opinion. Before I proceed to his ſecond, I will examine this.

1. As to his tranſlating *Shevet* by *Virga*, it is by no means to be allowed in this Place. I ſay in this Place: For I deny not but the word ſometimes imports no leſs. But the *Jew* cannot be excuſed for thus rendring it here: And that upon many Accounts. For (1) in that he departs from the LXXII, who were *Jews*, and they render it by Ἀρχων. To the ſame ſenſe it is rendred by the *Targumiſt*, whom he elſewhere calls *Divine*. But I find he is not ſo fond of him, but he will depart from him to ſerve a turn, and to oppoſe the *Chriſtians*. (2) It is certain that this ſenſe of the word bears no manner of proportion to the other ſenſes of *Scepter* and *Tribe*, &c. which it hath in other Places. So that as he departs from the Ancients, ſo he takes in a ſenſe that is far from being the more common ſenſe of the word. (3) Nor is it by any means *Anſw.*

agreeable to the Context. They are *great* things that are ſaid of *Judah* in the Context, and ſuch as ſpeak him *bleſſed:* There is nothing that imports *Affliction* or *Miſery*; nothing that *leſſens* him. (4) Nor is the Expoſition agreeable to the Event of things. If *Afflictions* were predicted, they might better have agreed to the other Tribes than him. There could be nothing peculiar to him ſuppoſed in ſuch a ſad Prediction. Nay, of all the Tribes, it leaſt belong'd to him. The other Tribes were ſcattered and loſt. *Benjamin* was in After-times near extinct: The other Tribes were obſcure in compariſon with *Judah*. *Judah* was preſerved when the other Tribes were extinguiſhed; he was kept ſeparate, when the others were jumbled together; he governed, whiles the others were ſubject; he returned from his Captivity, when the reſt were loſt; and continued a Principal, when the others were but Acceſſories. He, by the *Jew*'s Confeſſion, gain'd a good part of the Bleſſing of the Primogeniture, from *Reuben*; and it was not likely that he ſhould have the Curſe with it.

2. For his rendring מחוקק (which we render *Law-giver*) by *Adverſarii ſtatuentes contra Judæos*, it is inſufferable. I challenge all the *Jews* to ſhew me any ſuch ſenſe

ſenſe of the word in all the Old Teſtament. *Judah* himſelf is called a *Law giver*; but ſure the *Jews* will not allow him to have decreed any ſevere things againſt himſelf. This is a lewd way of proceeding; deſtitute not of proof only, but of pretext. A ſtrange liberty the *Jew* takes, when he puts a ſenſe, upon *Jacob*'s words, and upon the *Chriſtian*'s Opinion too. At this rate he may conclude what he will, if he may have the liberty of forging the Premiſes. But I muſt obſerve that the *Jew* hath not Effrontery enough to lay the ſtreſs of his Cauſe upon this Interpretation, which can never hold. And therefore adds, that ſuppoſing this Expoſition (it muſt be *ſuppoſed* for it is impoſſible to prove it) then inſtead of *ſtatuentes*, &c. he would have it be, *Nec Scriba inter pedes ejus.* The cunning *Jew* could not but know that the former Expoſition would not hold: For *between his Feet* was left out quite; and beſides, it would have ſpoiled all, had it been put in; for it would not agree. If by *between his Feet* were meant his Offſpring, it would be hard to conceive that they ſhould be ſuppoſed to decree ſeverely againſt themſelves. Take it in what ſenſe we can, it will be hard to make it cohere with the reſt of the Text. And

therefore he forſakes *R. Sueb* there, and endeavours to patch up his Expoſition with a Fragment from *Abravenel*. To this lamentable ſhift is this Wretch driven to make this Expoſition conſiſtent. Thus unlucky is this *Jew* in his *firſt* conſiderable Opinion, as he would have it thought to be.

II. His *ſecond* conſiderable Opinion is that of *Abravenel*. And thus he delivers his Expoſition of the Text: ***Non deficiet ex Juda*** [*ejus ſemine*] ***aliquale Dominium, aut aliqua Juriſdictio, donec veniat Meſſias, cui erit regnum continuum, perpetuum & monarchicum***, i. e. *There ſhall not ceaſe from* Judah [*viz.* from his Seed] *ſome ſort of Dominion or Juriſdiction, till* Meſſias *come, whoſe Kingdom ſhall be continual, perpetual and monarchical.* He explains himſelf afterwards, and ſays, even after the coming of *Jeſus* there were certain Preſidents and Makers of Conſtitutions out of *Judah*, and that ſo there are to this Day; and conſequently, *Meſſias* is not yet come. This is his *ſecond* conſiderable Opinion, which I now proceed to examine. p. 591, 592.

Anſw. 1. That it lies upon him to prove that there is in *Judah* to this Day ſome Dominion and Juriſdiction left, that can amount

mount to that which may answer to *Scepter* in the Text. He affirms this indeed roundly, with his *ut notum est, as it is known.* But a *Christian* will expect some proof of this: And the several Princes under whose Protection the *Jews* are permitted to live, will not allow that they have any Dominion or Jurisdiction in their Countries. The *Jews* had not best pretend to it; if they do, they will soon find themselves deceived. They will find that they have very much to prove on this occasion. They must first prove that *de facto* they do exercise any such Dominion and Jurisdiction; and then that they do it *de jure*; and last of all, that they are descended from *Judah*. And this last may be the hardest Task of all, since their *Genealogical* Books or Tables are lost. I do not know what reason *Christians* have to take all this upon trust. In the mean time it is by the *Jews* confessed, that there was in *Judah* something of this Dominion and Jurisdiction to the Times of *Jesus*. So much is owned on all hands; but for the rest, the *Jews* are to prove it before we can believe it.

2. Whatever the *Jews* may say in their disputes with *Christians*, I am sure at other times, this, which they here affirm, is denied by them. I will appeal to *M. B. Israel*, in Genes. *M. B. Israel Quæst. 65.*

rael, and to *Abravenel*, to whom *Amram* refers us in this Queſtion. The firſt of theſe, in his Preamble to his Queſtion on *Gen.* 49. 10. inquires into the Cauſe why, if *Shilo* be *Meſſias*, how *Jacob* could ſay, the *Scepter ſhall not depart from* Judah, *nor a Law-giver from between his Feet, until* Shilo *come*; when God had threatned the *Iſraelites*, that for their ſins he would ſend them and their King into an unknown Land? *Quam pœnam* (ſays he) *nunc patimur, ſine Rege, ſine Principe, ſine Reginine agentes*, i. e. *Which puniſhment we now ſuffer, living without King, without Prince, and without Government.* *Abravenel* is as expreſs in this Matter; for where he reckons up the ſeveral kinds of Miſery of their Captivity; the third he ſays is this, that they were *without Kingdom, and without Dominion*, and without שבט משפט, i. e. *the Scepter of Judgment.* I need not cite any other Teſtimonies to this purpoſe: But the Reader that is curious may find more to this purpoſe in *Conſt. L'Empereur's Diſſertat. ad Leilorem in Benjamin. Itinerarium.*

Abravenel in ſua Libr. fol. 80. col. 2. Edit. Amſtel.

P. 523. The *Jew* proceeds and falls upon *Lyra*, for affirming that the Scepter did not depart from *Judah* till *Herod's* Time. But I am no ways concerned in that Matter, nor obliged to defend *Lyra*, if he has not managed

managed his Argument as he ought: And the ſame I ſay as to what he objects againſt *Adrichomius* and *Thomas Biatienſis* in his following Numbers. n. 591, & 591.

In his following Numbers he miſrepreſents the *Chriſtian*'s Doctrine, and repeats what hath been ſufficiently conſidered before; and therefore I do not think it worth my while to follow him. He tranſlates *Shevet* by *Regnum*; in which he deals very inſincerely. He makes *Jacob* ſay what he never did, when he affirms that he ſaid, *The Kingdom ſhall not depart from* Judah. n. 602.

The *Jew* pretends afterward that *Chriſtians* do not underſtand theſe words of *Jacob*. He ſays that thoſe words, *until* Shilo *come*, cannot be underſtood as if *Meſſias* came with a Deſign that the Kingdom ſhould ceaſe from *Judah* upon his coming, becauſe *Meſſias* was to be himſelf a King, of the Family of *Judah*. Beſides, *Meſſias* was promiſed to the *Jews* in *favour*, and not to *ruine* their Kingdom. This is the Subſtance of what he ſays; to which I anſwer: (1) That we do not affirm that the end of the coming of the *Meſſias* was to deſtroy the *Jewiſh* Polity and Power. It is enough to us that he came before it was deſtroyed; and that he was to do ſo according to this Prediction of n. 605.

Jacob. (2) That he was promiſed in *favour*, none more firmly believe than we *Chriſtians* do. (3) That if by *Meſſias* his being a King, he means a Temporal King or Prince (as the *Jews* believe in this Matter) we deny it; and ſo did *Jeſus*, who own'd that his Kingdom was not of this World. And 'tis a Temporal Power which the *Jews* contend for, and which they ſuppoſe ſometime lodged in *Judah*; and which the *Jew*, elſewhere, allows ſhould ceaſe upon the coming of *Meſſias*.

The *Jew* goes on. *If* (ſays he) Meſſias *is to be a King, why does* Jacob *ſay, the Scepter ſhall not depart from* Judah, *nor a Law-giver from between his Feet, until* Meſſias *come? He ought to have ſaid, it ſhall never depart.* The *Jew* ſays ſo it is. He tells us that עד hath a double ſignification in Holy Writ. Sometimes it ſignifies *for ever*; ſometimes, *untill*: And on that ſuppoſition, he takes the liberty to tranſlate the words of *Jacob* thus; *Non auferetur Sceptrum de Juda & Scriba inter filios ejus* (in æternum) *quia veniet Meſſias, cujus erit Regnum omnium populorum.* This Expoſition (he ſays) is confirmed becauſe the Accent *Jethib* follows the Adverb עד, which ſeparates it from what follows and joins it to what goes before; and then follows כי which ſignifies *quia*. He adds

a 606, & 607, 608.

adds that עד alone ſignifies *untill*, and then כי is ſuperfluous, when added to it, and is ſuppoſed to ſignifie no more. He adds that the *Chaldee* Paraphraſt, which is to him of Divine Authority, takes the Adverb עד in this double ſenſe, and expounds *Gen.* 49. 10, thus; *Non auferetur Dominium de Juda, & Scriba inter filios ejus unquam: donec veniat Meſſias, cujus erit Regnum; & ei aggregabuntur populi.* In which (ſays he) he only varies the *Species* and continuance of Dominion in the Seed of *Judah*, before and under the *Meſſias*; but he does not vary the *genus Dominantis in æternum*; it muſt always be in *Judah*. Before the *Meſſias* it was various and interrupted: But under the *Meſſias* it will be perpetual, &c. *Cujus erit Regnum*, &c. cannot belong to *Jeſus*; as appears from *John* 18.36. The *Jew* goes on and tells us, that n. 609.
the Repetition of עד twice by the *Chaldee* Paraphraſt, the latter of which ſignifies *Donec*, is for great reaſon: It implies (1) that the Dominion ſhould not paſs from *Judah* to another Tribe. And (2) that it ſhall continue there for ever. He adds n. 610.
that this overthrows the *Chriſtian's* Expoſition; and ſubjoins, that in *Jeſus* the Kingdom of *David* is not reſtored, according to the Prediction of *Amos*; and that *Jacob* predicts the coming of *Meſſias* in the *laſt*

laſt Days; which cannot agree to *Jeſus*
n. 611. What he adds under his next Number, is of little Moment, it being a Repetition of what he had ſaid before. In his laſt Number, after all this Pother, he leaves his Reader at liberty (if he think fit to take it) to follow both the Opinion of *R. Sueb*, and *Abravenel* joined together; tho' they be very different, as diſtant as *Rod* and *Scepter*, or *Ruling* and *being ſcourged*: And admires *Jacob* for uſing ſuch an equivocal word as *Shevet* is. To theſe things I anſwer,

1. For what the *Jew* ſays of the Adverb עד that it hath two ſeveral ſignifications in Holy Writ, I admit it; let him make the moſt of it. It does not follow that becauſe it ſometimes ſignifies *for ever*, ſometimes *untill*, it muſt in this place be taken in the firſt ſenſe. Such words are always interpretable *pro ſubjectâ materiâ*, i. e. *according to the ſubject matter*. He had done ſomething if he had given any Example where עד ſignifies *for ever*, when 'tis followed with the Particle כי as it is here. I can give him ſeveral Examples where it ſignifies *untill*; as, *Gen.* 26. 13. 2 *Sam.* 23. 10.

2. For his dividing or ſeparating עד from כי it is unreaſonable: And the reaſon which he offers for it, is trifling. He

ſays

ſays there is a *Jethib* upon ו, and that ſeparates it from what follows, and annexeth it to what goes before; and then it muſt neceſſarily ſignifie *for ever*. Thus he may amuſe his ignorant Reader; but will never convince him that underſtands theſe Matters. That there is a *Jethib*, I deny not; but that that Accent hath any ſuch Power I utterly deny. This fond Opinion is eaſily confuted from *Gen.* 50. 15. 1 *Kings* 14. v. 23. From theſe places (I doubt not but from many more) it will appear, that that Accent hath no ſuch force. It is farther evident that it hath no ſuch Power in this place, ו is it ſelf here ſeparated from the preceeding word by an *Athnach*, which is equivalent to a *Colon*. So that now there is no pretext left for this Diviſion which this *Jew* contends for. This was well obſerved by a converted *Jew*, in a Book he wrote againſt the *Jews* about 200 Years ago. He concludes his Obſervation with theſe words; *Idcirco eorum falſa inventio, ſeu malitia, deridenda atque rejicienda eſt: Præcipuè cùm à nullo veſtrorum expoſitorum id dictum reperiatur.* He calls this a falſe invention, and a piece of malice to be derided; and not warranted by any of their Expoſitors. The truth of it is, nothing can be more tranſparent than the Arti-

De Confutatione Hebraic. Sectæ. Argent. in A.D 1500.

Artifice of this *Jew* in this Matter. It is very hard to think that a Man of his great Wit and Learning ſhould ever think that there was any ſtrength in what was in this Matter affirmed: It might ſerve indeed to amuſe a weak *Chriſtian*, but could never convince a Wiſe one. But he is more inexcuſable ſtill, for affirming that this Expoſition is neceſſary; and that becauſe כי he fancies would be ſuperfluous if עד muſt be joined to what follows; whereas he could not but know that elſewhere theſe two Particles are joined, and ſignifie no more than *Untill*.

3. What he offers from *Onkelos* is next to be conſidered. He ſays that the *Chaldee* Paraphraſt is *Supremæ Authoritatis*, i e. *of Supreme Authority*. He may think him ſo when he ſerves his turn; but at other times he departs from him, as we have ſeen before. I doubt not but to make it appear, whatever his Authority be, that he hath ſaid nothing that will either help the *Jew* or hurt the *Chriſtian*. I will, however, follow the *Jew* cloſely, and conſider with all poſſible Care and Application whatever *Onkelos* offers.

I have always had a great Opinion of *Onkelos*. But I ſtill believe, in Queſtions of this Nature, the *Hebrew* Text only to be of *Supreme Authority*. But I ſhall proceed

ceed to conſider what is offered from *Onkelos*. The *Jew* ſays that *Onkelos* takes the Adverb עד in both the ſenſes mentioned above. This he thinks appears from his Paraphraſe on the Place, which he turns into *Latin* thus. *Non auferetur Dominium de Juda, & Scriba inter filios ejus unquam; donec veniat Meſſias, cujus erit Regnum; & ei aggregabuntur populi.* I will not quarrel with the *Jew* for his Verſion; though I do not think it an unexceptionable Expoſition from the *Chaldee*. But I will admit it for once: What does the *Jew* infer from hence? *Viz.* That there always muſt be Government in *Judah*, before the *Meſſias*, and under him. But all that *Onkelos* ſays is, that there ſhall be always ſome Governour in *Judah* till *Meſſias* come, whoſe is the Kingdom. The *Jew* pretends that *Jeſus* renounced the Kingdom, and therefore he cannot be the *Meſſias*: But that has been anſwered above. *Jeſus* only ſays his Kingdom was not of this World: He was not ſuch a King as the *Jews* expected. Let us then grant that *Onkelos* teaches us that the Dominion ſhould not paſs from Tribe to Tribe, and that in *Meſſias* it ſhould be perpetual: I do not ſee how this can bear upon *Chriſtians*. We own our *Jeſus* to be a King, and that his Kingdom will have no End: are we there- n. 608.

therefore obliged to think him a Temporal King?

n. 610. He pretends that this Account given before hath ruin'd the *Chriſtian*'s Expoſition. But I confeſs I cannot ſee it. He pretends, likewiſe, that this Text cannot belong to *Jeſus*; becauſe he hath not raiſed up the *Kingdom* (it is *Tabernacle* in *Amos*) of *David*, according to the Prediction of *Amos*: and again, becauſe the *Meſſias* was to come in the *laſt Days*; which *Jeſus* did not, thoſe laſt Days not being yet paſt, though near at hand. I anſwer,

Amos 9. 11.

That others will judge, what hurt the *Chriſtians* have received from this *Jew*: For my own part, I ſee nothing of it. For what he ſays of the Prediction of *Amos*, I do not know what he would have. Had he formed thence any Argument againſt *Jeſus*, I ſhould have thought my ſelf obliged to anſwer it: And ſhall not fail to do it, if any ſuch thing be laid in my way. I ſhall be ſo far from declining it, that I ſhall be glad of the occaſion. What he ſays of *Jeſus*, that he did not come in the *laſt Days*, ſhall be conſidered fully in its proper Place.

He is very courteous, after all this ſtir he has made, to leave his Reader the liberty (if he thinks fit) to believe with

Such

Sueb, and *Abravenel* likewise. Their Opinions are so distant from one another, that it will be very hard for the same Man to believe them both. But he that believes what the *Jew* hath said on this occasion may do much.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

The CONTENTS.

That the Meſſias *is come is proved from* Haggai *ch.* 2. verſe 6, 7, &c. *The occaſion of thoſe words. Of the* Deſire of all Nations. *Of the* greater Glory *of the* Second Temple. *What Accounts the* Jews *give of that Matter. The Vanity of what they offer upon that occaſion. A Pretence that* this latter Houſe *is not to be meant of the* Second Temple. Abravenel *is juſtly expoſed for advancing an Obſervation to that purpoſe. Several Arguments to prove that the* Latter Houſe *is to be underſtood of the* Second Temple. *Some Pretences of* J. Aben Amram *conſidered. His* Firſt *Pretence, with an Anſwer thereunto. An Anſwer to his* Second *Pretence. An Anſwer to his* Third, Fourth, Fifth, *and* Sixth. *The Interpretation of* J. Aben Amram *upon the words of the Prophet. The Vanity of his Interpretation ſhewed in ſeveral particulars.*

THAT the *Meſſias* is come, may be farther proved againſt the *Jews* from the words of the Prophet *Haggai*; in which his

his Coming is foretold during the ſtanding of the *Second Temple:* That Temple hath been deſtroyed for above theſe 1600 Years; and conſequently the *Meſſias* did come above 1600 Years ago. The words of the Prophet are theſe: *For thus ſaith the Lord of Hoſts, yet once it is a little while, and I will ſhake the Heavens and the Earth, and the Sea and the dry Land: And I will ſhake all Nations, and the deſire of all Nations ſhall come; and I will fill this Houſe with Glory, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts. The Silver is mine, and the Gold is mine, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts. The Glory of this latter Houſe ſhall be greater than of the former, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts: And in this place will I give Peace, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts*; Haggai 2. *v.* 6, 7, 8, 9. For the better comprehending the Deſign of theſe words, it is to be conſidered, that the Temple which *Solomon* built was deſtroyed by the *Chaldees*; and that the People were now newly returned from the *Babylonian* Captivity, and were upon building another Temple to the Lord. To the doing of this they are quickened and encouraged by this Prophet; *ch.* 1. 8. And his endeavours to this purpoſe are ſucceſsfull, *v* 14. But then ſo it was (and 'twas a diſcouraging Conſideration) that the *Second* Temple, that was building, was

ſhort of that which *Solomon* built. Under this diſcouragement they are required *not to fear*. v. 5. *For thus ſaith the Lord of Hoſts*, &c.

I ſhall not in this Place enter upon the Conſideration of all the words which I have cited out of the Prophet, both becauſe I have elſewhere had an occaſion to make uſe of them, and becauſe I have had a farther occaſion to reflect upon them in my preceeding Diſcourſe, where I have treated of the *Perpetuity of the Law of* MOSES. At the preſent it ſhall ſuffice that I inſiſt upon that part of them only in which my preſent Argument is concerned: And that is, the Promiſe that is here made that the *Meſſias* ſhall come in the time of this *Second* Temple; and that his Preſence in it ſhall render the Glory of this Houſe greater than the Glory of the *Former* Temple, which *Solomon* built. 'Tis expreſly ſaid *That the Deſire of all Nations ſhall come*; and that God will *fill this Houſe with Glory*; and that the *Glory of this Latter Houſe ſhall be greater than of the Former*.

Part I. p. 83.

That by the *Deſire of all Nations* is meant the *Meſſias*, no *Chriſtian* queſtions, and no *Jew* can reaſonably deny. For though he was to be born of the Nation of the *Jews*, yet not for *their* Benefit only.

ly. He was at *Firſt* promiſed as a Bleſſing to *Humane* Race, before there was any Nation of the *Jews*: And again, after this, to *Abraham*, as one in whom *all the Nations of the Earth* ſhould *be bleſſed*; and ſpoken of by *Jacob*, as the *Shiloh*, to whom ſhould be *the gathering of the People*. Many Prophecies there are in the Old Teſtament that ſpeak of the Bleſſings the *Nations* ſhould receive from the *Meſſias*; and from whence it may fairly be concluded, that he was deſigned to be *a light to lighten the Gentiles*, as well as *the Glory of his People Iſrael*. Agreeably whereunto the Angel proclaimed to the Shepherds, upon the Birth of *Jeſus*, ſaying, *I bring you good tidings of great Joy, which ſhall be to all People*. (Luke 2. 10.) 'Tis enough that by the *Deſire of all Nations*, in this place, be meant that Perſon that was moſt deſirable, and would be the greateſt Bleſſing to them. It is not ſuppoſed that the Nations had an Expectation of him, but that he was worthy of all Acceptation when he did appear.

Gen. 3. 15. Gen. 12. 3. Ch 18. 18. & 22. 18. Ch 49. 10.

God promiſeth alſo to fill this Houſe *with Glory*; and *that the Glory of this Houſe* ſhould *be greater* than that of the *former*, i. e. of *Solomon's*. Now that it could not be in Splendor and Riches, or in reſpect of the Symbols and Tokens of God's ſpe-

cial Favour to that *Second* Temple. For, as hath been obſerved elſewhere, it came much ſhort, in this reſpect, of the Temple of *Solomon*. And therefore it is to be conſidered, in what reſpect the Glory of *this* Houſe ſhould exceed the Glory of *that*.

And that can only be upon the Account of the Preſence of the *Meſſias*, who was to come not only *in the time* of this *Second* Temple, but was to come *into it*, and honour it with his Preſence. And for the Proof of this, I may well call in the Teſtimony of the Prophet *Malachy*, who ſpeaks expreſly to this Matter. *The Lord whom ye ſeek ſhall ſuddenly come into his Temple, even the Meſſenger of the Covenant whom ye delight in.* Chap. 3. 1. By the *Lord*, in this Place, ſeveral of the *Jews* themſelves underſtand *King Meſſias*; and, indeed, the Place muſt be underſtood of him; as will appear to him who conſiders the Context. And thence it was that the wiſer *Jews* expected him about the time that our *Jeſus* was born; as I have elſewhere ſhewed. And in this Temple was our *Jeſus* preſented by his Mother; there at twelve Years old he ſate among the Doctors. We find him often there: *Wiſt ye not* (ſays he) to his Mother, that ſought him ſorrowing, *that I muſt be* ἐν τοῖς

v. Dr. Pocock on Malac. 3. 1

Part I. p. 100.

τοῖς τοῦ πατρός i. e. *in my Father's House* as 'tis in the *Syriac*, and as the words are thought to import. As the *Messias* was to come before the Dissolution of the *Civil Polity* of the *Jews*, according to the Prediction of *Jacob*, Gen. 49. 10. so he was also to come before the Dissolution of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* of the *Jews*, or before the Destruction of the *Second* Temple. And our *Jesus* did come according to these Predictions. § Fuller Miscell. l. 4. ch. 17.

I shall now consider what the *Jews* say to this, and how they interpret the words: And here I shall, with all sincerity, represent their pretences, and shew the Vanity of them.

I only premise that they ought to alledge somewhat very material in this Matter, *viz.* to prove that the Glory of this House was greater than that of *Solomon's*. (1.) Because 'tis very certain that it was in many particulars very short of it. They who had seen *Solomon's* wept, when they saw the Foundation of this; so far did it come short of it. And we may learn from this Prophet that this Temple, in comparison of *Solomon's*, was *as nothing*. Besides, the *Jews* tell of several things of great Moment wanting in this Temple; *viz.* The *Ark*, the *Urim* and *Thummim*, *Fire* from *Heaven*, the *Shechinah*, and *H. Ghost*: Ezr. 3. 3, 12. Hagg. 2. 3.

Ghoſt: The *Spirit* of *Prophecy* ceaſed under it: It was defiled by *Antiochus*, and the *Romans*; and the Succeſſion of the H. Prieſts diſturbed. It muſt be ſomething very conſiderable that can make up theſe great Defects. (2.) The People of the *Jews* are in this Prophet ſuppoſed under great Fear and Diſcouragement, and the Prophet is ſent to put them in heart: Be *ſtrong* and *fear not*, ſays the Prophet. 'Tis but reaſonable that what he offers from God to encourage them, and diſcharge them of their Fears muſt have Weight and Force enough to that purpoſe: And therefore the *greater Glory*, which is promiſed *v.* 9. muſt be ſo explained, that it may be a *Comfort* and *Encouragement* to them to whom theſe words are ſpoken.

Hagg. 2.

Let us ſee now what the *Jews* have to offer to us upon this Occaſion. Three things they have to ſay:

1. *Firſt*, That the Glory of this *Second* Houſe was greater than that of the *Firſt*, becauſe it continued *longer*. *Solomon's* Temple (ſay they) continued but 410 Years before it was deſtroyed by the *Babylonians*; but this *Second* Temple ſtood 420 Years before it was deſtroyed by the *Romans*; and in that reſpect, and upon that Account, the Glory of this *Latter* Houſe

Houſe was greater than the Glory of the *Former*.

But could this be any Comfort or Encouragement to theſe *Builders*, who cannot be preſumed to know before how long this Houſe would continue? Is the Continuance of *Ten* Years ſuch a mighty thing? Will this make a Compenſation for the Defects before mentioned? Does God ſay, he will *ſhake the Heaven and the Earth* for *this*? Is *this* all that God deſigned or promiſed when he ſaid that he would *fill this Houſe with Glory*? Will *this* make it more glorious than the Houſe which *Solomon* built? If the bare Continuance of a few Years longer be ſuch an Addition of Glory; the *Tabernacle* of *Moſes* was more glorious than the *Temple* of *Solomon*: And if the *Romans* had chanced to deſtroy the *Second* Temple ten Years ſooner, all this promiſed Glory had been loſt; and ſo it would have been if *Solomon*'s Temple had ſtood ten Years longer. What encouragement could this be? Of what force to animate the People, and to diſpell their Fears? Could the *People of the Land* tell how long preciſely *Solomon*'s Temple ſtood, and how long this ſhould ſtand? If they did not underſtand this, how could it be of any force to encourage them? Is there any thing in the Text that

ſpeaks of the Duration of this Houſe? There is ſomething to this purpoſe, or there is not: If there be, let the *Jew* ſhew us where to find it: If not, they muſt excuſe us, if we do not give credit to it.

II. The *Jews* pretend the Glory of *this* Houſe to have been greater than that of *Solomon*, upon Account of the *Coſt* which *Herod* beſtowed upon it, and of the *Gifts* with which it was enriched by the Kings of the Earth.

But it is to be conſidered, what *Proof* they can produce that this *Second* Temple was more *enriched* than that of *Solomon*: We require them to *prove* this; and to produce greater Evidence than that of the Teſtimony of *Ben Gorion*.

Suppoſe this *were* proved, it would be to no purpoſe. What encouragement could this be to the People of the Land to build this Houſe? Will the Gold and precious Gifts of the *Gentile* Kings fill it with a Glory beyond the Glory of *Solomon*'s Temple? Will the Loſs of the *Ark*, the *Fire* from *Heaven*, the *Holy Oyl*, and *Spirit* of *Prophecy*, &c. which were wanting in *this* Temple, and were in the time of *Solomon*'s; will theſe Defects be made up and compenſated with *Herod*'s Expence, and the Gifts of ſome Heathen Princes?

Princes? Is Silver and Gold fit to be put in the Balance againſt thoſe Symbols of the Divine Favour? Does God regard Gold and Silver?

(*mores,*
Quid juvat hoc, Templis noſtros immittere
Et bona Diis ex hâc ſceleratâ ducere pulpâ?

Is it likely that God ſhould, in ſuch ſolemn Words, promiſe no more to this People, to encourage them to build, than ſuch things as theſe? Becauſe *we* are fond of Gold, do we think that *God* is ſo likewiſe?

Theſe things are ſo vain, that ſeveral of the *Jews* themſelves have been forced to quit theſe Pretences; and have therefore ſtretched their Wits to find out ſomething elſe to ſay; and have frankly owned that theſe things want weight, and are inſufficient in this preſent Argument.

III. They do therefore pretend that by *this latter Houſe*, v. 9. is not meant the *Second* Temple, that was then building when theſe words were ſpoken, but a *Third* Houſe, that is ſtill to be built when the long Captivity, the *Jews* are now in, ſhall come to an End. *Abravenel* and others have betaken themſelves to this ſhift, not being able to defend thoſe which I have named

Abravenel in Hagg. 2. *R. Iſaac Chizuk Emunah.* p. 289.

named before. This *Third* Temple ('tis pretended) is that which *Ezekiel* deſcribes, and is to be built in the Days of the *Meſſias*: And then thoſe things which were wanting under the *Second* Temple (*viz.* the *Ark*, *Holy Oyl*, &c.) ſhall be reſtored.

Abravenel in Hagg. Queſt. 4.

Abravenel pretends that the words of the Text require, that *this latter Houſe* muſt be underſtood, not of a *Second*, but of a *Third* Houſe at leaſt. And to this purpoſe he affirms that the *Hebrew* word [האחרון] which we tranſlate *latter*, with the word [ראשון] which we render *former*, can by no means be underſtood of *Two only*; but muſt of Neceſſity import *Three* at leaſt. And to that purpoſe he appeals to the firſt of *Geneſis*; where the firſt and ſecond Day are not expreſſed by ראשון and אחרון, but by אחד and שני.

Indeed if what he ſays were true, it would be of great Moment in the preſent Queſtion: But it is ſo far from being true, that it is manifeſtly falſe, as I ſhall make appear. When God ſent *Moſes* to *Egypt*, *Moſes* objected that the People would not believe that God had ſent him: But God gives him a Command to ſhew two Signs of his Miſſion, by turning his Rod into a Serpent; and by putting his Hand into his Boſom, and turning it into another

Exod. 4. 8, 9.

Co-

Colour, or as leprous as Snow. It follows, if they will not *believe thee, neither hearken to the Voice of the firſt Sign* [האת הראשון] *That they will believe the Voice of the latter Sign* [האת האחרון] i. e. of the *Second* Sign, as 'tis in the *Greek*. This does abundantly confute what *Abravenel* would advance to ſerve his turn. For here we find ראשון and אחרון to denote *Two* only: This is evident from what goes *before*; and alſo from what *follows*, v. 9. — *If they will not believe theſe two Signs*, &c. Again, Divorce of a Wife was allowed by *Moſes*: The Divorced Woman might marry to another Husband, but might not return to her former. The *Firſt* Husband is called ראשון, the *Second* אחרון: And therefore theſe words (which are the ſame with thoſe in the Prophet) do not neceſſarily imply more than *Two*. And for his Allegation out of the Firſt of *Geneſis*, 'tis of no Moment in this Caſe: And he that will look into 2 *Kings* 6. 28, 29. will find that no certain Rule can be made from them.

Τῆ δευτέρᾳ Lxxii.

Deu 24. 3.

I ſhall therefore proceed to make it appear that the words, v. 9. do belong to the *Second Temple*. If this be made good, I have entirely, and beyond all Contradiction, gained my Point: For the *other* pretences, the *Jews* themſelves have been forced

ced to quit; and have run to this as their laſt hold and refuge.

And to make it appear, that the words *v.* 9. where the Glory of *this latter Houſe* is promiſed, and that it ſhall be greater than that of *Solomon*'s, do belong to the *Second* Temple, and not to a *Third* ſtill to be built; I offer the following Particulars to be conſidered, for proof hereof.

I. The main *Deſign* of this Prophecy: And that may ſoon be learned from the Prophecy it ſelf. It was to encourage the *Jews* to build their Temple, upon their return from the Captivity of *Babylon*. Of this there can be no Queſtion. We ſee the Prophet reproves their Backwardneſs, *Ch.* 1.2,4. Puts them upon building: *v.* 8. Lets them know that the Calamities which befell them were ſent for their Negligence in not building this *Second* Temple, *v.* 9, 10, 11. 'Tis evident that this Part of this Prophecy can have no reference to any *Third* Temple, but of Neceſſity muſt refer to the *Second* Temple only.

II. The *Diſcouragement* the People were under at this time. They were but poor; had many Enemies, that had hindred them: And after all, they were not like to build that which could anſwer to the Tem-

Temple of *Solomon*, which the *Chaldees* had deſtroyed. It was not, for Glory, to be compared to it. *Ch.* 2. v. 3. This muſt be underſtood of this *Second* Temple, and cannot poſſibly belong to a *Third*.

III. The Method taken by the Prophet (God's Meſſenger, *ch.* 1. 13.) to *encourage* them in the building this *Second* Temple: And 'tis reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the Meſſenger whom *God* ſends, ſhould offer ſome *Encouragement* that would be ſuitable, and that would bear ſome proportion, to the *Diſcouragement* and *Difficulty* which they were then under. The *Diſcouragements* they were under were, partly from their *Enemies*, and partly from the *Meanneſs* of this Houſe in compariſon with the *Glory* of *Solomon's*. (*Ch.* 2. 3.) With reſpect to the *Firſt*, the Prophet aſſures them that *God will be with them*, ch. 1. 14. 2. 4. And then they need not *fear* their Enemies. (*v.* 4, 5.) But then as to the *Meanneſs* and *Deſpicableneſs* of this *Second* Houſe, which they were building, in compariſon with the *Glory* of *Solomon's*, God aſſures them, by his Prophet, that he will make that up: *That he will fill this Houſe with Glory.* (v. 7.) Nor is this all: For whereas ſome of them remembred the Glory of *Solomon's* Temple, he

he farther aſſures them, that *the Glory* of *this latter Houſe* (or, *Second* Temple) *ſhall be greater than of the former*. It was very proper to encourage their Diligence, by aſſuring them that the Defects of this *Second* Houſe ſhould be ſome other way made up: But according to *Abravenel's* Expoſition, the words of *v.* 9. could not have encouraged the *Jews* to build the *Second* Temple. Suppoſing the *latter Houſe* ſignified a *Third*, which ſhould be built ſome Thouſands of Years afterward, and many hundreds after this *Second* Houſe ſhould be deſtroyed, that now they are exhorted to build; what *Encouragement* could this be to build this *Second* Houſe? Why ſhould they build that which was ſo mean, and that which would be deſtroyed to make room for a better, that ſhould be built they knew not when, or by whom? We have little *Encouragement* to build what is deſigned to be taken down again.

IV. There is no mention of a *Third* Houſe in any other Part of the Prophet; and the words *v.* 9. will by no means juſtifie this Interpretation of *Abravenel*. For, as I have ſhewed, there is no Connexion between the ſenſe of the words which this *Jew* contends for, and the words that go before,

before, and the main Deſign of the Prophecy; no Manner of mention before of a *Third* Houſe; no reaſon from the words as they lie in the *Hebrew*, to put this Interpretation upon them, as I have demonſtrated already: Beſides all this, the words themſelves, as they lie in the *Text*, are very Emphatical; and conſidered with the *Context*, deliver to us a certain ſenſe that excludes this Interpretation of the *Jew*, and muſt be underſtood of the *Second* Temple. The words are הבית הזה האחרון. *This latter Houſe*, we render it. The words manifeſtly point at ſome Houſe that was ſpoken of before: And if we had tranſlated them by *this ſecond Houſe* (as *Diodati* hath done) we had given the true ſenſe of the words; and the Text it ſelf would have born us out. For if what we render by *Former*, ſignifie the *Firſt*, what we render *Latter* may well be rendered by *Second*; eſpecially ſince the *Hebrew* words ſignifie thus in other Places, as I have obſerved before. To which we may add, that the *Hebrew* words are accompanied with a demonſtrative Particle, three times repeated; that we might thereby be out of doubt what Houſe is meant; and might not fancy the words to ſpeak of an Houſe not mentioned before. *Quæſta Secunda Caſa.*

To

To what hath been ſaid before I add, that the Temple built by the *Jews*, after their return from the Captivity of *Babylon*, was the *ſame* Temple (or *Second* Houſe, as the *Jews* always call it) which was deſtroyed by the *Romans* in the Days of *Veſpaſian*. The *Jews* conſent with the *Chriſtians* in this Matter, as is well known to thoſe who are converſant in their Writings; who conſtantly call it בית שני, the *Second Houſe*. It is true, it was profaned by *Antiochus Epiphanes*, and otherwiſe damaged; and the continual Sacrifice was taken away for ſome Years: After this, it was repaired and cleanſed, and dedicated anew in the time of the *Maccabees*; and the *Feaſt of Dedication* (mentioned in St. *John*'s Goſpel) was annually kept, in remembrance thereof, on the 25th Day of the Month *Caſleu* (called alſo the *Feaſt of Lights*) which anſwers to our Month *November*: Yet after this Change, it is owned ſtill to be the *ſame* Houſe. After this it received great Alteration in the Days of *Herod* the Great. I will not call in queſtion the truth of what *Joſephus* relates upon this occaſion. Admitting all that he ſays to be true, that *Herod* laid a new Foundation, and that he enlarged its Courts, and raiſed the Fabrick higher, yet was it ſtill allowed to be the *ſame* Temple;

V. Selden de Synedr. l. 3. c. 13.

ple; and is conſtantly called the *Second Houſe* by the *Jewiſh* Writers. They own but a *Firſt* and a *Second*. We reckon thus in *other* Matters. We reckon *that* the ſame *River*, which yet in proceſs of time is much enlarged, and ſwells over a larger Compaſs of Ground than it did before. The ſame may be ſaid of *Houſes* and *Cities*, which retain the ſame Name after very many Additions and Enlargements. And an *Infant* is the ſame Perſon, and is juſtly called by the ſame Name in his Infancy, which belongs to him when he is arrived to his full Age.

After I had written the foregoing lines, I met with a *MS.* written by a *Jew*, intitled *Porta Veritatis*; of which I have made mention before. That *Jew* labours hard to wreſt this Prophecy of *Haggai* out of the Hands of the *Chriſtians*, and to prove that it makes nothing to their purpoſe. I did expect from him great Matters, and ſhall conſider what he hath offered upon this occaſion which hath not been conſidered before. And the Reader may take his pretences in the following Severals. *J. Aben Auram, n. 677, &c.*

Firſt, He pretends that *Jeſus* could not be called in truth the *Deſire of all Nations*; becauſe the *Jews* (to whom the *Meſſias* was promiſed) rejected him when he ap-

peared, and continue to do ſo ſtill: Nor did the *Romans*, who were the greateſt Nation when he appeared, deſire him; and therefore *all Nations* deſired him not.

But if what hath been ſaid before be duly conſidered, there will be no weight in this pretence. The *Jews*, indeed, generally rejected him; but yet ſome of them received him alſo: And the *Roman* Empire did afterwards embrace his Religion, and ſoon found that it was the greateſt Bleſſing, and that the Author of it was of all the moſt deſirable one.

Secondly, He pretends that thoſe words, *yet once, it is a little while, and I will ſhake the Heavens*, &c. *v.* 6. cannot belong to this Matter. And that becauſe it was about 400 Years after this that *Jeſus* appeared; which is too long a Space to be called *a little while*: And alſo, becauſe we have no Account of this *ſhaking* predicted by the Prophet.

I anſwer that both *Abravenel*, and this *Jew* afterwards, endeavour to apply this Prophecy to a *Third* Temple ſtill to be built. And if *a little while* cannot ſuit with the *Chriſtian*'s Interpretation, I would fain know how it can conſiſt with that of the *Jews*?

For

For the *ſhaking* predicted by the Prophet, I have accounted for it elſewhere; and ſhall not repeat what I have there ſaid, upon this occaſion.

Thirdly, he pretends that thoſe words *v.* 9. *And in this place will I give Peace*, forbid us to underſtand this Prediction of the *Second* Temple, becauſe during the ſtanding of this Temple, and that which *Herod* built, there were Wars between the *Jews* and *Greeks*, among the *Maccabites*, with *Herod*, and againſt the *Romans*.

But this is of no Weight in this place, becauſe it is manifeſt that the greater Glory of this Houſe, above that of *Solomon*'s, conſiſted in this, that the *Meſſias* (called *Shiloh*, Gen. 49. 10.) the Prince of Peace, appeared here: Who was not only the Preacher of Peace, but the great Procurer of it between God and Man; as well as among Men with one another.

Fourthly, He pretends that by the *Deſire of all Nations*, is meant, either Perſons of Quality and Condition, that came to this Temple out of Honour to it; or that it is to be underſtood of the Gold and other precious things, with which in after-times it was adorned: And he lays a ſtreſs upon this, that the word *Come*, in the *Hebrew*, being Plural, agreeably to it he ſup-

poſeth that, *deſire* may comprehend *deſirable Perſons* or *things*.

All which is ſo trifling, and unproved, that it requires no Anſwer at all. The *Enallage* of Number is very frequent among the *Hebrews*.

Fifthly, He pretends that *Jeſus* did not come during the ſtanding of the *Second* Temple; but in the time of the Temple of *Herod*, which he calls the *Third*; and then his Preſence could not be the Glory of that *Second* Houſe, ſpoken of by the Prophet.

But in this he goes againſt the ſenſe of all the *Jews*; and this Matter hath been alſo conſidered above.

Sixthly, This *Jew* pretends, that on ſuppoſition that the Prophet does not ſpeak of
n. 685. the *Meſſias* in this place, that then he treats of the *Second* Temple: Which in that Caſe he pretends to be greater than that which was built by *Solomon*, upon theſe three Accounts. (1.) In reſpect of its Duration. Whereas the Temple of *Solomon* ſtood but 410, this continued 420 Years; or more, if *Joſephus* may be credited. Again, (2.) They did not come to *Solomon*'s Temple from the Ends of the Earth, as they did to the *Second* Temple: The *Romans* offering up continual Sacrifice in the *Second*; as, he ſays, *Joſephus* affirms in ſeveral

ſeveral Places. (3.) Becauſe the Structure of the *Third* Temple, in the room of the *Second*, by *Herod*, was more magnificent than that of the *Firſt*: And according to this Expoſition, the Prophet (he ſays) encouraged *Zorobabel* and the other *Jews*, to proceed in their building this *Second* Temple. I anſwer,

1. That whether the Prophet ſpeak of the *Meſſias*, or not, (as it is certain he does) 'tis manifeſt that he ſpeaks of the *Second* Temple; as hath been ſhewed before: And therefore the *Jews* ought to ſhew how the Glory of that *Second* Houſe could be ſaid to be greater than the Glory of the *Former*.

2. What the *Jew* ſays of the Duration of the *Second* Temple 10 Years longer than that of the *Firſt*, does not prove it. (1.) Becauſe that wants proof it ſelf. He hath not attempted to prove that it ſtood longer; and we are not obliged to take it upon his word. (2.) That if he could prove this, yet would this be no Argument of its greater Glory, as hath been ſhewed above. (3.) What the *Jew* affirms under his *Third* Head, quite overthrows what he affirms under the *Firſt*. For he reckons the Magnificence of *Herod*'s Temple, as an Argument of the greater Glory mentioned by the Prophet: And yet he

calls *Herod*'s Temple the *Third*, built in the room of the *Second*. If it were really the *Third*, how can that prove the greater Glory of the *Second*? Again, if it were the *Third*, then his firſt Reaſon from *Duration* is utterly deſtroyed: For according to this Account, the *Second* Temple ſtood leſs time than the *Firſt*, by very many Years. So that the *Jew* overthrows his own Work, and hath entangled himſelf before he is aware.

3. For the *Romans* offering Sacrifice, it is nothing to the purpoſe. How could the Offerings of Heathens add Glory to the Houſe of God? Beſides, that was a contingent thing, and if they had *not* done it, according to the *Jew*'s Opinion, the Glory of the *Second* Houſe had failed; which is very unreaſonable to ſuppoſe. After all, what *Encouragement* could theſe things afford to *Zorobabel* and the *Jews*, to build the *Second* Houſe? Who could not know of theſe Events; and if they could have foreſeen them, they could not have been encouraged by them.

Theſe things are ſo tranſparently ſhifts, that this *Jew* thought fit not to rely upon them; but betakes himſelf to another Expoſition of theſe words. I ſhall follow him, and ſee what he hath to offer worthy of Notice.

To

To do him right, he does allow that the אחרון, in the Text, does ſignifie ſometimes no more than *Second*; and he produceth Inſtances to prove it from *Exod.* 4. 9. and *Gen.* 33. In this he ſhews greater Sincerity than *Abravenel* had done. I proceed to his *New* Expoſition; which he thinks, he ſays, may be better than his former. n. 687.

He would have us underſtand the Prophet predicting the building of the *Laſt* Temple, which the *Jews* expect hereafter in the Days of their long expected *Meſſias*; and this he adheres to, as probably the trueſt meaning of the Prophet *Haggai*. And then he makes the Prophet's meaning to be this: (*Haggai* ch. 2. *v.* 6.) *Yet once it is a little while*, &c. *q. d. Adhuc unum modicum illa*, which he ſays is according to the *Hebrew* Text; and the meaning is, that, for the *illa*, i. e. *illa Domus ſecunda*, i. e. that *Second* Houſe, which the *Jews* were then building, it ſhould continue but a little while; and not for ever, as they hoped the *Laſt* Houſe, which ſhould be afterward built in the Days of the *Meſſias*, would do: *I will ſhake the Heavens*, &c. *i. e.* I will *ſhake the Univerſe* &c. in the laſt Days, when the *Meſſias* ſhall come and reduce and redeem the ſcattered n. 688.

Iſraelites, and build the *Laſt* Temple: *And the Deſire of all Nations ſhall come*, i. e. when this *Laſt* Temple is built, and the Nations ſubdued to their *Meſſias*, then ſhall the beſt of the *Gentiles* come to worſhip the Lord of Hoſts at *Jeruſalem*: *And I will fill this Houſe with Glory*, i. e. Then will I fill this *Laſt* Houſe with Glory. *Iſtam Domum*, i. e. not the Houſe which *Zorobabel* built, which was to endure but a little while; but this *Laſt* Houſe. But then the *Jew*, being ſenſible that this would ſeem a little harſh, that that ſhould be called, an Houſe, and *this Houſe* which was not then built, he adds, that *Iſtam*, This, refers to the *Place* or *Area*, where the *Second* Houſe ſtood, but not to the *Structure* which was built upon it. He lays great ſtreſs upon the word *Noviſſimæ*, v. 9. uſed by St. *Hierom*; which he is willing to underſtand of this *Laſt* Houſe ſtill to be built; though he was before diſpleaſed with him for uſing that word when it did not ſeem to ſerve his purpoſe. This is the main of what the *Jew* hath to ſay, and his laſt Effort.

I ſhall make ſome Reflections upon what this *Jew* hath offered upon this occaſion.

Firſt,

Firſt, What he ſays *here* deſtroys his *Second* Pretence or Exception, which I mentioned above.

Secondly, This Account is very far from being conſiſtent with that *Encouragement* which the Prophet gives to *Zorobabel* and the Builders to go on with their Building. They would have little heart to build when they are told (as they are by this *Jew* ſuppoſed to be) that their Building ſhall ſtand but a little while.

Thirdly, His Interpretation of thoſe words, *the Deſire of all Nations ſhall come*, is dogmatically delivered; but without any offer of *Proof*, that that is the meaning of the words.

Fourthly, His interpreting *this Houſe* of an Houſe that was to be built hereafter, is the moſt extravagant conceit imaginable. 'Tis inconſiſtent with the *Context*, with the letter and plain meaning of the *Text*, with the purpoſe of the Prophet; and, in truth, with common ſenſe. This Houſe was not *then* built: 'Tis not *yet* built, after above 2000 Years expired: Nor does the *Jew* pretend to know *when* it *will* be built. And when the Prophet

is

is ſpeaking of an Houſe that was building, and encouraging the *Jews* to go on with it, and pointing all along at it, to affirm that by this Houſe is meant an Houſe hereafter to be built, is beyond all belief. But thus will Men blunder that oppoſe the Truth, and would wreſt ſo Noble a Prophecy out of the *Chriſtian*'s Hands.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

The CONTENTS.

The Promiſe of the Meſſias *is* abſolute, *not* conditional. *The* Jews *give up their Cauſe when they deny this. The* Meſſias *was promiſed as a great Bleſſing to the* Gentiles. *There is no Condition annexed to the Promiſe of the Coming of* Meſſias. *The Time is fixed within which he was to come. The Impenitence of the* Jews *could not hinder his coming. That the coming of* Meſſias *is a fundamental Article of the* Jewiſh *Faith; and therefore the Promiſe cannot be conditional. An Enquiry for what Sins of the* Jews *they can pretend that the Coming of* Meſſias *is delayed. That the* Jews, *in this Matter, are inconſiſtent with themſelves. The* Jews *are not all of a Mind in this Queſtion. Of the different Caſe of the Prophets who foretold* Good, *from that of them who foretold* Evil. *Of the* laſt Days, *in which the* Meſſias *was to come. In what Terms the* Days (*or Time*) *of the* Meſſias *are expreſſed by the Ancient* Hebrews: *How it is expreſſed by the* Chaldee *Paraphraſts, and how by the Writers*

ters of the New Teſtament. Of the true Sence and Importance of the laſt Days, *when applied to the Time of the* Meſſias. *They are the ſame with the* World to come; *and that to be explained with reference to the* Jewiſh *Polity. Times, in Holy Writ, are divided with regard to the* Church, *or to the* World. *With reſpect to the* Church *they are to be conſidered as* before *and* under *the* Law; *and under the* Meſſias. *Times with reſpect to this* World *are reckoned by the* four Kingdoms *in* Daniel. *This may be called the greater* Kalendar. *Of the leſs or provincial* Kalendar *in* Daniel. *That the* Jews *have no Cauſe to object againſt the Time in which* Jeſus *did appear. That the Time in which* Jeſus *appeared was the ſame with the* laſt Days; *both with reſpect to the* Jewiſh *Church, or* Moſaick *Oeconomy, as alſo with reſpect to the four great* Kingdoms *in* Daniel.

II. I Shall now prove that the Promiſe of the *Meſſias* is an *Abſolute* and not a *Conditional* Promiſe, and therefore an *Unalterable* one: And that it does not depend upon the Condition that the *Jews* repent them of their Sins. Nor ſhall I paſs by this Pretence of the *Jews*, becauſe they do not produce any probable Grounds for

for the Support thereof. For ſince it is ſo commonly received among them, and is of a moſt dangerous Conſequence, I ſhall take the more pains to expoſe, and ſhow the Vanity thereof. And to that purpoſe I ſhall commend to ſerious Conſideration the following Particulars.

I. That the *Jews*, in affirming the Promiſe of the Coming of the *Meſſias* to be *conditional*, do in truth give up their Cauſe. The Old Teſtament is expreſs as to the Time of his Coming: He was to come before the *Jewiſh* Polity was quite diſſolved, during the ſtanding of the *Second* Temple; and within the Compaſs of *Daniel*'s Weeks. All theſe Times are long ſince lapſed; and this Subter-fuge, which the *Jews* betake themſelves to, is a tacit Confeſſion, that the Time ſet for the Coming of the *Meſſias* is expired. For this Pretence being attended with no Grounds, which the *Jews* are able to produce in its Defence, is only an Argument that they are not able to keep their Ground, when they are by the *Chriſtians* preſs'd with Proofs, that are beyond Exception, that the Time appointed for the Coming of the *Meſſias* is paſt. They would have no need to fly to this Refuge, were they not forced out of the Field.

II. This

II. This vain Pretence of the *Jews* ſuppoſeth that which cannot be granted; *viz.* that the *Meſſias* was to come only upon Account of the *Jews*; whereas He was to appear on behalf of the *Gentiles* alſo: It is therefore ridiculous to ſuppoſe that the Impenitence of the *Jews* ſhould hinder his coming. He was promiſed before there was ſuch a People as the *Jews* in the World; in the Days of *Adam* the common Parent of Mankind; and after that, to *Abraham*, as that *Seed* in which, not only the *Jews* but, all the *Families of the Earth* ſhould be *bleſſed*. It is true he was to ariſe from the *Jews*; but in the very Place whence that is collected, it is alſo ſaid, that to him ſhall *the gathering of the People be*. This is ſo evident a truth, that *Abravenel* reckons this among the Characters of the *Meſſias*, that the *Gentiles ſhall ſeek him*; and that not only the *Iſraelites*, but all People ſhall be ſubjected to him: And to this purpoſe he applies ſeveral Paſſages in the Old Teſtament belonging to this Mattter. I have elſewhere produced many Teſtimonies hereof; which I ſhall not need to repeat here. The *Gentiles* being concern'd in his Appearance, 'tis not reaſonable to ſuppoſe that the Impenitence of the *Jews* ſhould retard it. He was to

Gen. 49. 10.

Abravenel in Iſa. 11.

Part I. chap. 9.

be

be *a Light to lighten the Gentiles*, as well as the *Glory of the People of* Iſrael.

III. The Promiſe of the Time when the *Meſſias* ſhould come, hath no *Condition* annexed to it; and is therefore an *abſolute* Promiſe. 'Tis great Sawcineſs in *us* to annex a Condition, where *God* hath made no mention of any. There is not in thoſe three famous Places, which I have mentioned above, any intimation of a Condition annexed to this Promiſe: And 'tis not credible that the Time ſhould be delayed. Four hundred and thirty Years were allotted for the Sojourning of the *Iſraelites*, and their Forefathers, and for the finiſhing their Oppreſſion: Did God delay this time of their Deliverance? By no means. *It came to paſs at the End of the four hundred and thirty Years, even the ſelf ſame Day it came to paſs, that all the Hoſts of the Lord went out from the Land of* Egypt. Again, after ſeventy Years Captivity, God reſtored his People from *Babylon*, becauſe he had promiſed no leſs; *For thus ſaith the Lord, that after ſeventy Years be accompliſhed at* Babylon, *I will viſit you, and perform my good word towards you, in cauſing you to return to this place.* Shall we affirm that God failed in this great Promiſe, and that a Condition, and ſuch

Gen. 15. 13. with Exod. 12. 41.

ſuch a Condition too as may for ever obſtruct the making this Promiſe good, is to be underſtood, though no where expreſſed? Here is no ſhadow for this Pretence. On the other hand, 'tis very evident that the Promiſe was *abſolute*, and not *conditional*. For we have not only a Promiſe of the *Meſſias*, but the *Time* within which he was to come is preciſely limited, the *Place* is expreſſed where he was to be born, the *Family* named out of which he was to ariſe, and many other particulars relating to his Birth and Life and Death and Burial, *&c.* are predicted. 'Tis very abſurd to allow all this in a Promiſe that is *conditional* only.

IV. This Condition, of the Repentance of the *Jews*, can by no means be admitted: For, not to inſiſt upon what hath been ſaid before, that the *Meſſias* was promiſed from the Beginning of the World, and for the ſake of the *Gentiles*; certain it is that the Impenitence of the *Jews* could not obſtruct his Coming. For this very Impenitence of the *Jews* is predicted alſo by thoſe very Prophets which foretell the Coming of the *Meſſias*; and the very Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, which ſuppoſeth the great Wickedneſs of the *Jews*, is foretold by *Daniel*, even then when he pre-

preciſely lays down the Time of the Coming of the *Meſſias*. There's the greateſt need of a Phyſician when Diſeaſes are rife and raging. It cannot be denied but that the *Meſſias*, when he came, was to bring Men to a right Mind: His Fore-runner alſo was to prepare and diſpoſe them to Repentance. And 'tis therefore vain to pretend that the *Meſſias* did not come, becauſe the *Jews* did not repent: For the *Meſſias* comes to call Men to Repentance. And tho' Repentance be a Preparative for the Reception of the *Meſſias*, yet the Impenitence of the *Jews* could not obſtruct his Coming, the main end of which was to bring Men to Repentance. *Abravenel* tells us, that their Wiſemen ſay, that *the Son of* David *will not come, unleſs it be to a Generation which is altogether pure, or altogether unclean:* If this be true, the Wickedneſs of the *Jews* cannot hinder his Coming.

Jer. 31. 32. Mal. 4. 5, 6.

Abrav. cap. fidei, c. 14.

V. The Coming of the *Meſſias* is reckoned by the *Jewiſh* Writers a *Fundamental* Point of their *Law*; and is therefore placed among the Articles of the *Jewiſh Creed:* But this vain Opinion ſubverts it quite, and undermines the Truth of a great and Fundamental Point of their Religion. For if the Coming of the *Meſſias* depend upon the *Merit* or *Repentance* of

Abrav. cap. fid. c. 14.

the *Jews*, what Aſſurance can they or we ever have that he will come at all? For ſuppoſing that the *Jews* will obſtinately continue in Impenitence, he will not come at all. So that we can have no greater Aſſurance, according to this Principle, that the *Meſſias* will come, than we have that the *Jews* will repent: And this is to ſuppoſe that a main Article of their Religion may be falſe.

VI. I would fain know what are the Sins which the *Jews* continue in to this Day, which, as they pretend, hinder the Coming of the *Meſſias*? Before they were carried Captive into *Babylon*, they were guilty of *Idolatry*, and Contempt of the Law of *Moſes*: They were, for their Sins Captives in *Babylon* ſeventy Years. When that time was expired, they returned to their own Land: There they continued ſome Hundreds of Years; there they dwelt ſome Years after they had put our *Jeſus* to Death: They were deſtroyed by the *Romans* about 1600 Years ago; and ever ſince that, have been ſcattered over the Face of the Earth, and have been a Scorn and By-word to them that are round about them. They never were able to form themſelves into a diſtinct Polity ſince: They have been ſo far from that, that

that they live diſperſed among their Enemies; and many, and almoſt innumerable, are the Afflictions and Oppreſſions which they have been followed with, from the Enemies among whom they have lived from Age to Age. A Man would be apt to conclude, from theſe long and ſevere Sufferings, that they are indeed great Sinners: But whatever the Sins of the *Jews* are, for which they are ſo ſeverely chaſtiſed or puniſhed, it is not for thoſe Sins which ſent them into *Babylon*. We cannot accuſe them of *Idolatry*; nor yet of a total Neglect of the Law of *Moſes*. For *Idolatry*, they are far from it; and the worſhipping any Image is that which they deteſt, and upon all Occaſions declaim againſt. For the Law of *Moſes*, they cannot be accuſed for a total Neglect of that neither. Many of thoſe Precepts of *Moſes* they do not indeed conform to: But they are excuſed from them by that Law it ſelf. For thoſe Precepts were annexed to the Land of *Canaan*, or to the *Temple*; and do not oblige themſelfwhere. Such were their Laws about Tythings, Firſt-fruits, Sacrifices, and many other, which are now rendred unpracticable by the Providence of God. For the *other* Precepts, they obſerve them ſtill. They keep their Sabbath, and Feaſt of Unleavened-

bread, and their other Feſtivals, as far as they can. They circumciſe their Males, wear their Phylacteries and Fringes, and obſerve many other of the Rites of their Law. But yet they continue *without a* Hoſ. 3. 4. *King, and without a Prince, and without Sacrifice, and without an Image, and without an Ephod, and without Teraphim.* In a word, they are a People ſcattered and peeled, and who have for many hundred of Years been deluded with falſe *Chriſts* and Prophets, and greatly afflicted in ſtrange Lands. What is their *Sin*, I would know?

Their *Crucifying* of *Jeſus* they will not allow to be a *Crime*: And if it were not a *Crime*, it was a *Vertue*. Their putting a falſe *Chriſt* to Death (for ſo they believe *Jeſus* to be) is ſo far from being a Fault, that it was an acceptable Service. This would be ſo far from obſtructing the Coming of the true *Meſſias*, that it would rather haſten it.

Will they ſay, they are thus ſeverely puniſhed for the Idolatry of their Forefathers before the Captivity? Or will they affirm, as they ſometime have done, that there is no Calamity befalls them but hath an Ounce of the *Golden Calf* in it? Will they pretend that upon Conſideration of the Rebellion of theſe their Anceſtors,

ſtors, God delays to ſend the *Meſſias* in his appointed time? There is no ſhadow for this Pretence: For the Prophets, who lived after the Times of that Idolatry, did not only predict the Coming of the *Meſſias*, but the preciſe Time alſo when he ſhould appear. It would be to queſtion their Authority, to ſuppoſe they would have done this if God had altered his purpoſe of ſending the *Meſſias*, upon the Account of the Idolatry of their Fore-fathers.

VII. The *Jews*, at other times, are very inconſiſtent with themſelves; and are ſo far from owning their Sins to be the Cauſe why God does not ſend the *Meſſias* (under which Conſideration they ought to be very humble) that they juſtifie themſelves, and vaunt as Gods peculiar. Thus *Abravenel* interprets the 53d of *Iſaiah* of the Sufferings of *Iſrael*; and conſequently, takes off the Guilt from them that ſuffer. For certain it is, that the *Sufferer*, in that Chapter, is not the *Sinner*; for he is repreſented as *bearing the Iniquities of others*, and as one that had *done no Violence, neither was any Deceit in his Mouth.* And I find ſeveral of the *Jewiſh* Writers giving ſuch an Interpretation of *Dan.* 9. 24. as is inconſiſtent with this Pretence, that the *Meſſias*

Abravenel in Iſa. 53.

is not ſent becauſe the *Jews* continue in their Sins. Thus *R. Solomon*, upon thoſe words, *To finiſh Tranſgreſſion, and to make an end of Sins* (Dan. 9. 24.) hath theſe words, *i. e. That* Iſrael *may receive their full Puniſhment in the Captivity of* Titus, *and the Bondage of* Edom; *that their Tranſgreſſions may be finiſhed, and their Sins made an end of, and their Iniquities expiated, and ſo everlaſting Righteouſneſs introduced.* And to the ſame purpoſe another *Jewiſh* Commentator ſpeaks upon the ſame words. He tells us that thoſe Tranſgreſſions and Sins, which in the *Captivity* of *Babylon* were not conſumed or finiſhed, ſhall be finiſhed in *this* long *Captivity: For* (ſays he) *ſuch a great Captivity ſhall expiate Iniquity, and the Houſe of* Iſrael *ſhall ſin no more.* According to theſe Men, theſe Sufferings were to puriſie the *Jews*, and prepare them for the greateſt Bleſſings: They have been 1600 Years already in this Furnace of Affliction; and one might juſtly expect, that, in this time, their filthineſs might have been conſumed, and that their *Sins* ſhould not ſtill obſtruct the Coming of the *Meſſias*.

R. Salom. and Jacchiad in Dan. 9. 24.

VIII. The *Jews* themſelves, though they uſe this Pretence when they are preſſed by *Chriſtians*, are not conſtant in it: Nor does

does the whole Nation agree that the Promiſe is conditional. *Abravenel* tells us, that, according to *Hillel*, there is a two-fold Term of the Coming of the *Meſſias*; one of which is *contingent* and *alterable*; namely, if the *Iſraelites* repent; for then he ſhall haſten his Work, and prevent the Time of his Coming: The Second is *neceſſary* and *fixed*; this is known to God, and determined *abſolutely*, whether the *Iſraelites* repent or not: Beyond this time, *Meſſias* will not tarry: And of both theſe the *Hebrew* Doctors expound the words of the Prophet, *I the Lord will haſten it in his time*; i. e. *If they deſerve, I will haſten it*; *if they deſerve not, it ſhall be in its time.* So that they are forced, after all, to allow a *ſet* and *fixed* Time; and conſequently an *abſolute* Promiſe, that the *Meſſias* ſhould come. This is enough to my preſent purpoſe: Their pretence that it ſhould be haſtened, hath no ſhadow of ground to build upon. They are forced to acknowledge a certain fixed Time. *Menaſſeh Ben Iſrael*, in his Epiſtle to his Reader before his *Spes Iſraelis*, tells us, that the Deſign of his Book is to ſhew, that their hope, *in which they live*, of the Coming of the *Meſſias*, is of a future good, difficult, but *infallible*, *Quia fundatur in abſolutâ promiſſione Dei benedicti*, i. e.

De cap. fidei, c. 14.

Iſa. 60. 22.

becauſe it is built upon the abſolute Promiſe of the bleſſed God. To the ſame purpoſe, *R. Bechai* tells us, that *Redemption depends upon Repentance; but if Repentance do not intervene, the fixed Time for it ſhall not be moved.* And to that purpoſe he applies that Law concerning the Redemption of Land. If a Man ſold his Land, his Kinſman might redeem it; If his Kinſman did it not, he might do it himſelf: If he were not able, it would yet return at the Year of *Jubilee:* So though Repentance might haſten the Redemption (ſays he) yet if that happen not, there is a Time fixed, like the Year of *Jubilee*, that will bring our Releaſe. Hence 'tis plain that the *Jews* are forced, at laſt, to own that there is a fixed and determined Time for the Coming of the *Meſſias*; I have already ſhewed that the Time fixed is expired.

In Pentat. fol. 160. col. 4.

Lev. 25. 25.

IX. That the Promiſe of the *Meſſias* being a Promiſe of a great *Good*, according to the *Jewiſh* Principles, it cannot fail of being made good. The Prophets might predict an *Evil*; and though that *Evil* came *not* to paſs, they are for all that to be reputed *true* Prophets. The Reaſon is plain, and may be fetched from *Jer.* 18.8. The threatned Evil might be prevented by the

the *Repentance* of them who were thus threatned. But the Prophet who foretels *Good* to come, if that *Good* come *not*, is to be reputed a *falſe* Prophet. For God does not promiſe a Bleſſing, (though it be a *conditional* Promiſe) but it always comes to paſs, ſays *Maimonides*. Nor have we a ſure Rule, unleſs this be admitted, (ſays the ſame Author in another Place) to judge of the Truth of Prophecy. This was the Caſe between *Hananiah* and *Jeremiah*: *Jeremiah* predicted Evil to come, *Hananiah* Good: Now *Jeremiah* might have been a *true* Prophet, though the *Evil* had not come to paſs (as he is brought in ſaying to *Hananiah* by *Maimon*) becauſe God might have Mercy on the People on their *Repentance*: But if the *Good* which *Hananiah* foretold did not come to paſs, he muſt needs be a *falſe* Prophet, and nothing but the Event could prove him to be a *true* one. This ſeems to be the meaning of *Jeremiah*'s words to him, *Jer.* 28.7, 8, 9. *Hear now this word*, &c. *The Prophets that have been before me, and before thee of Old, propheſied both againſt many Countries, and againſt great Kingdoms, of War, and of Evil, and of Peſtilence.* In this Caſe, though the Event followed not, yet they ought not to be thought *falſe* Prophets; But he goes

H. Fund. Legis. c. 10. *V. Port. Moſis.* p. 25, 26.

on

on and tells him, *The Prophet which propheſieth of Peace, when the word of the Prophet ſhall come to paſs, then ſhall the Prophet be known, that the Lord hath truly ſent him.* Whence it follows, that as we cannot conclude him to be a falſe Prophet who threatens an Evil that happens not; ſo we cannot have Cauſe to believe him to be a true Prophet who promiſes a Bleſſing, till that Bleſſing confirms the truth of the Prophecy: And therefore to ſuppoſe the *Meſſias* not come in the Time foretold, is to reproach the Prophets who foretold this his Coming.

And thus I have expoſed the Vanity of that Pretence of the *Jews*, that the Promiſe of the *Meſſias* was *conditional*, and depended upon the Repentance of the *Jews*: of which Matter I have ſaid, I hope, what is ſufficient; tho' not all that might have been ſaid. I proceed to ſhew,

III. That allowing the *laſt Days* to denote the Days of the *Meſſias*, this is no Objection againſt our *Jeſus*, whoſe coming was in theſe *laſt Days*. And if this be made good, there will be no ground for the *Jews*, on this Account, to expect a *Meſſias* towards the End of the World, and near the time of the General Reſurrection. And for the better ſpeaking to this whole Matter, I ſhall, *Firſt*,

First, Shew in what Terms the Ancient *Hebrews* do expreſs the Times of the *Meſſias*; where that of the *laſt Days* will fall in.

Secondly, I ſhall conſider the true Sence and Importance of this, *of the laſt Days*.

Thirdly, I ſhall briefly ſhew, that hence the *Jews* have no Cauſe to object againſt our *Jeſus*.

First, I ſhall ſhew in what Terms the Days of the *Meſſias* are expreſſed by the Ancient *Hebrews*.

For the Writers of the Old Teſtament, we grant readily that the Days of the *Meſſias* are called the *laſt Days*. *Jacob* tells his Sons what ſhall befall them in the *laſt Days*, when he predicts the Birth of the *Meſſias*. Thus the Prophet *Iſaiah*, *and it ſhall come to paſs in the laſt Days, that the Mountain of the Lord's Houſe*, &c. Thus *Daniel*, *there is a God in Heaven that revealeth Secrets, and maketh known to the King* Nebuchadnezzar *what ſhall be in the latter Days*. Thus *Hoſea*, *afterward ſhall the Children of* Iſrael *return, and ſeek the Lord their God, and* David *their King, and ſhall fear the Lord, and his Goodneſs, in the latter Days*. Where inſtead of thoſe words, *and* David *their King*, the *Chaldee* Para-

Gen. 49. 1. with 9. 10.

Iſa. 2. 2.

Dan. 2. 28.

Hoſ. 3. 5. with the Targum.

Paraphraſt hath theſe, *and they ſhall obey* Meſſias *the Son of* David *their King.* By which it is evident, that by the *latter Days* he meant the Days of the *Meſſias.* Thus *Micah, in the laſt Days it ſhall come to paſs that the Mountain of the Houſe of the Lord,* &c. where the *laſt Days* refer to the Days of the *Meſſias*; and *Kimchi* expreſly ſays ſo upon the words. We have no Controverſie with the *Jews* in this Matter.

Micah 4. 1. with R. D. Kimchi.

Let us now ſee how the *Chaldee* Paraphraſts expreſs the Time of the *Meſſias*; which they do with ſome Variety: By the *End*, or *Extremity of Days*, which is the ſame with the *laſt Days.* Thus the *Jeruſalem Targum* on *Gen.* 3. 15. hath it; *In the End of the Extremity of Days, in the Days of King* Meſſias. And the *Targum* of *Jonathan*, upon *Exod.* 40. 9. mentions the King *Meſſias, who was to come, that he might redeem* Iſrael, *in the End of Days.* And the *Targum* on *Eccleſiaſtes* 1. 11. by *thoſe that ſhall come after, gives us to underſtand thoſe that ſhall be in the Days of the* Meſſias. Elſewhere the time of the *Meſſias* is expreſſed by the *World to come.* Thus the *Targumiſt* on *Pſalm* 110. 4. upon thoſe words, *Thou art a Prieſt for ever after the Order of* Melchizedeck, hath paraphraſed thus; *Thou ſhalt be great in the World to come,*

come, becauſe thou waſt a righteous King. And to the ſame purpoſe the *Targumiſt* on the 1ſt of *Kings* 4. 33. where of *Solomon* 'tis ſaid, *That he ſpake of Trees, from the Cedar-tree that is in* Lebanon, *even unto the Hyſſop that ſpringeth out of the Wall:* Upon which the words of the *Targumiſt* are theſe: *He propheſied of the Kings of the Houſe of* David, *that were to reign in this World, and in the World to come of the* Meſſias. And among the other *Jewiſh* Writers, nothing is more common than to call the times of the *Meſſias* the עולם הבא, i. e. *the World to come.* Sometime this Time is called *the End of the World.* See *Targ. Hieroſol.* in *Exod.* 12. 42. Heb. 1. 2. Acts 2. 17. 1 Pet. 1. 20. Mat. 20. 6 1 Joh. 2. 18. Heb. 9. 26. Heb. 2. 5. 1 Cor. 10. 11.

Agreeably hereunto, our New Teſtament ſpeaks of the Days of the *Meſſias*, or time of *Chriſt*'s Appearance and Kingdom: 'Tis called the *laſt Days*, and the *laſt Time:* The *Eleventh*, and the *laſt* Hour, which is the ſame with the *laſt* Time, there being no new Age and Diſpenſation to ſucceed unto it: 'Tis ſometimes called the *End*, or *Ends of the World*, and alſo the *World to come.* Which expreſſions, as they are conformable to the *Hebrew* way of expreſſing this Matter, ſo they being made uſe of by the Writers of the New Teſtament, it evidently follows that they who uſed them, looked upon them

them as very expreſſive of that to which they applied them. And that they are ſo will appear by conſidering,

Secondly, The true Sence and Importance of the *laſt Days*, when apply'd to the Days of the *Meſſias*:

And before I paſs on to that, I ſhall ſay ſomething to the other Expreſſions of the *End* of the *World*, in which the *Meſſias* was to come; and *the World to come*, by which the Times of the *Meſſias* is expreſſed. We need not from hence caſt the Coming of the *Meſſias* to the *Cloſe* of this World, and begin his Kingdom from thence. *The Authors of the* Jews *Law called* Talmud (as a Learned Man obſerved long ſince) *treating of Sacrifices in the Chapter*, פר הרטאת, i. e. *the Bullock of the Sin offering*, *contained the whole time of this Life, from* Adam *the Firſt-man to the laſt that ever ſhall be born, in two Worlds; which in* Hebrew *they call* עולמים: *The Firſt from the beginning of things created to the coming of Chriſt; the Second from that time to the Reſurrection of the Dead. This Tradition of the* Hebrews *made an end of the Old World in the coming of Chriſt.* This Opinion of the *Jews* was the Senſe of their Wiſe-men. For hence it was that they called the time of the

Mr. *Lively's* Chronology of the *Perſian* Monarchy *p.* 250.

the *Messias* the *World to come:* For that Expression must refer to some World or Age that went before it, and to which this was to succeed; and that must be the *Jewish* State and Oeconomy. And 'tis certain that, with respect thereunto, our *Jesus* did appear in the End of the *World*, i.e. of the *Jewish* State and Polity. And that by the *End of the World*, when it refers to the Coming of the *Messias*, cannot be meant the Destruction of this lower World, is evident; not only from the Confession of those *Jews*, who grant some Thousands of Years for the Continuance of this Kingdom of the *Messias* in this World, but also from the express Testimonies of the Holy Scriptures. For thus the *Psalmist* speaks of this time of the *Messias*: *They shall fear thee as long as the Sun and Moon endure, throughout all Generations. His Name shall endure for ever*, &c. Again, *His Seed shall endure for ever, and his Throne as the Sun before me. It shall be established for ever, as the Moon, and as a faithful Witness in Heaven.* For that those Places belong to the *Messias*, I appeal to the *Jews* themselves.

V. G. Vorstii. not. ad c. 14. Abraw. cap. fid.

Ps. 72. 5, 17. Ps. 89. 36, 37.

That the Times of the *Messias* are expressed by the Phrase of the *World to come*, is evident; hardly any thing is more common than this way of speaking among the

the *Hebrew* Writers: The State of the *Jews*, or Oeconomy of *Moſes*, muſt therefore be the *Age* or *World* to which this ſucceeded. By the *End of World* (in which the *Meſſias* was to come) muſt of Neceſſity be meant, then, either the *final Cloſe* and *Diſſolution* of this material World, or elſe the End of the *Jewiſh Polity*: For no Man can be ſo ſtupid as to underſtand it of the End of the *World to come*, as that imports the Days of the *Meſſias*: it cannot be underſtood of this *lower and material World*, conſiſtently with the Doctrine of the *Jewiſh* Writers; and therefore the *End of the World* (when that Expreſſion relates to the Coming of the *Meſſias*) muſt be underſtood of the *End* of the *Jewiſh Polity*.

And this *End* of the *Jewiſh Polity* is very fitly expreſſed, in the New Teſtament, Mat. 24. 3. with Mark 13. 4. Luke 21. 7. by συντέλεια τῦ αἰῶνος, the End of that *Seculum* or *Age*, when the *Jewiſh Polity* was to be diſſolved. This ſeems to be the meaning of that Queſtion, *Matth.* 24. 3. if we compare it with the parallel Places. 1 Cor. 10. 11. Heb. 9. 26. And becauſe ſeveral Ages were run out, from *Moſes*, to that Time when the *Jewiſh* Polity and *Moſaical* Oeconomy was near its End, therefore that Time is elſewhere called τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων, and in another Place συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων: The *Ends*, or *End*

End of the several Ages of the *Mosaical* Oeconomy. Sometime it is called the *End: But the End is not yet.* (Mat. 24. 6.) This is very fitly expressed after this Manner. For we find this Time by *Daniel* called the *Consummation*, or *End:* And the Destruction of the *Jews* is expressed, elsewhere, after the same Manner. (*Ezek.* 7. 2, 6.) And the Times preceeding the Dissolution of the *Jewish* Polity, I am now speaking of, are called by *Tobit* (ch. 14. *v.* 5.) Καίροι τοῦ αἰῶνος. And this Time by *Moses* is called the *latter Days.*

Dan 9. 27. Καὶ ἕως τῆς συντελείας καιρῆ συντέλεια δοθήσεται, LXXII. *V. Tob Heb. P. Fag c.14. v. 5. N. B.* Deu. 31. 29.

And now it will be no hard Matter to give account of the Importance of the Phrase, *the last Days*, when it refers to the Coming or Kingdom of the *Messias.*

Times, in the Holy Scriptures, are divided with regard to the *Church*, or to the *World:*

With respect to the *Church*, the most remarkable Times are these three: *First*, The Time *before* the *Law*, from *Adam* to *Moses: Secondly*, The Time *under* the *Law*, *viz.* from *Moses* to the Dissolution of the *Jewish Polity*, and that Dispersion of the *Jews*, which rendred them uncapable of practising those Laws which were annexed to their Land and Temple: *Thirdly*, The Times of the *Messias*, which the *Jews* are wont to call the *World* or *Age* to come.

The Times may alſo be conſidered with reference and reſpect to this *World*, and the *Kingdoms* of it. *Daniel* gives us a particular Account of the *Four* great *Kingdoms* of this *World*, ſucceeding one to another: And they are that of *Babylon*, that of the *Medes* and *Perſians*, that of the *Greeks*; and the laſt that of the *Romans*: And with this reference and reſpect, whatever fell out in the Time of the *Romans*, might be ſaid to happen in the *laſt Days*. So that ſpeaking in general, the *laſt Time* is the Time of the *laſt Kingdom* or *Empire*; the *latter Time*, as a part of it, is the *latter Part* of this *Kingdom*.

Dan. 2. 44.

And as the *Four* great *Kingdoms* in *Daniel* are the *Great Kalendar* by which the Times are, with reference to the *World*, to be diſtinguiſhed; ſo there is to be found in the ſame Prophet a *Leſs* and a *Provincial Kalendar*, with reference to the *Legal Worſhip*, or *Jewiſh State*: And that is the *ſeventy Weeks* of *Daniel*, or 490 Years: In which Time the *Meſſias* was to come; after which the *Jewiſh* Polity was to be diſſolved.

Thirdly, I ſhall now briefly ſhew, that the *Jews* have from hence no Cauſe to object againſt our *Jeſus*.

That

That Time in which *Jeſus* did appear was the *laſt Time*, or the *laſt Days*, both with reſpect to the *Jewiſh* Church, and the *Moſaical* Oeconomy; and with reſpect to the great *Kingdoms* of this *World*, mentioned by the Prophet *Daniel*.

With reſpect to the *Jewiſh State*, it was the *laſt Days* when *Jeſus* did appear. It was not long before the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* and the *Temple*, and miſerable Diſſolution of their Polity. *Jeſus* lived in that very Age when that lamentable Deſtruction happened to the *Jews*: He did not only foretell it, but ſaid alſo that it ſhould come to paſs in that Age; *Verily I ſay unto you, this Generation ſhall not paſs till all theſe things be fulfilled.* And that Time was the *laſt Days* of that *State*; and 'twas within the Time of the ſtanding of the *Jewiſh* Polity, City, and Temple, that *Meſſias* was to come, according to the Prediction of *Jacob*, of *Daniel*, of *Haggai*, and *Malachy*. Matth. 24. 34

And then, with reſpect to the *World*, or the *Four* great *Kingdoms* in *Daniel*, the Time when *Jeſus* appeared was alſo the *laſt Days*, or the *laſt Time*. He was baptized in the Reign of *Tiberius Cæſar*; and his Fore-runner preached in the Fifteenth Year of his Reign, when *Pontius Pilate* was Governour of *Judæa*. This was the Luke 3. 1. Dan. 2. 44.

Time in which that *Kingdom* was to be ſet up, *never to be deſtroyed*; and the *God of Heaven*, ſays *Daniel*, ſhall ſet it up. And hence it is that the Kingdom of the *Meſſias* is, by the *Chaldee* Paraphraſt, ſometimes, called the *Kingdom of God*; and conformably hereunto, in the Goſpel it is called ſometime the *Kingdom of God*; and elſewhere, in a parallel Place, the *Kingdom of Heaven*: It being ſet up, as *Daniel* expreſſeth it, by the *God of Heaven*.

V. Chald. Paraphr. on Iſa. 52. 7. with *v.* 13.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

The CONTENTS.

An Hiſtorical Account of the falſe Chriſts *that have appeared ſince our Saviour's Time in the ſeveral Ages, according to the Prediction of* Jeſus, *John* 5. 43. *The Hiſtory of* Bar Cochab: *An Account of* Moſes Cretenſis, *and* Dunaan *and* Julian: *Of* Mahomet, *and a* Syrian *Impoſtor, and another in* France. *Of another that appeared in* Perſia, *A. D.* 1138, *and another, in the ſame Century, who appeared at* Corduba *in* Spain: *Of one, mentioned by* Maimon, *in the Kingdom of* Fez; *as alſo one in* Arabia, *and another beyond* Euphrates. *Another diſturbs* Perſia: *Another ariſes in* Moravia: *Another mentioned by the Author of* Shevet Jehuda. *An Account of* David el David. *Of ſeveral others that appeared in* Spain, Germany, *and* Eaſt-India. *A more particular Account of* Sabatai Sevi. *Of* R. Mordecai. *The Uſefulneſs of this Account in ſeveral Particulars: To which is added an Account of the Deſtruction and Extirpation of the* Jews *out of the Empire of* Perſia. *The Relation of* Antoni-

us Montezinus *made to* M. B Iſrael, *concerning the* Ten Tribes. *The ſtreſs which* M. B. Iſrael *laid upon it. The great Vanity thereof. The great Variety of Opinions among the* Jews, *concerning the Coming of* Meſſias; *and their Inconſiſtence.*

I Shall in the next Place give an Account of the many *Impoſtors* which have impoſed upon the *Jews*, ſince the Time of our *Jeſus*, to this very Age in which we live; and ſhall afterwards ſay ſomething of the Uſefulneſs of this Account.

It is very well known (and a moſt ſurprizing Conſideration it is) that the *Jews* rejected *Jeſus*, and to this Day continue ſo to do: Yet was *Jeſus* born at the very *Time*, and in the *Place*, and of the *Family*, and after the *ſupernatural Manner*, which were predicted by the Prophets. His Birth was foretold by an Angel, declared and publiſhed by an Heavenly Hoſt, ſignified by a Star, and owned by the Eaſtern Sages, as well as by the devouter Perſons of the Houſe of *Iſrael*. He lived a moſt Holy and Heavenly Life, a moſt innocent and uſefull one: And as he *ſpake as never Man ſpake*, ſo he confirmed his words by works which none but God could do. He ſealed his Doctrine with his

his Bloud, he roſe from the Dead, and ſent the Holy Ghoſt from Heaven, and ſpread his Holy Religion in the World, not only without humane Aid and Force, but maugre all the oppoſition and force the World could make againſt it. In a word, he gave ſufficient proof that he came from God; and yet when *he came unto his own, his own received him not.*

And yet this People, in After-times, and even to this very Age in which we live, have been and are ſo very *credulous*, that they ſuffer themſelves to be deluded with Cheats and Impoſtors, who have led them aſide, to their great Loſs and Deſtruction. They who were obſtinately bent upon the rejecting of our *Jeſus*, have been very prone ever ſince to embrace and entertain falſe People and Impoſtors. The words which *Jeſus* ſaid unto them have been abundantly verified, *I am come in my Father's Name, and ye receive me not: If another ſhall come in his own Name, him ye will receive.* Joh. 5. 43.

I have elſewhere given ſome Account of the Deceivers which appeared in the very firſt Times of *Chriſtianity*; eſpecially of thoſe who are mentioned by *Joſephus*. I ſhall now proceed to give a ſhort Hiſtory of the falſe *Chriſts*, and thoſe who pretended to be, at leaſt, his Fore-runners,

and ſuch Impoſtors as have from time to time impoſed upon the *Jewiſh* People.

I. I begin with *Bar Cochab* (which ſignifies the *Son of a Star*) in the Reign of *Hadrian*. He was the Head of the *Jews* in their Rebellion; he pretended to be the *Meſſias*, and bore the Title of *the Son of a Star*, with alluſion to what we read *Numb.* 24. 17. He would be thought a Star from Heaven, to give Light and Eaſe to his afflicted Country-men. He pretended to a Miracle, and made oſtentation of ſending forth a Flame out of his Mouth. He was one of great Cruelty; which he exerciſed eſpecially againſt *Chriſtians*, to make them renounce their Saviour. Incredible Numbers were ſlain by him, and by his Followers; and he occaſioned, at the laſt, a vaſt Slaughter of the *Jews*. The *Jews* crowned him; and *R. Akiba* proclaimed him to be the *Meſſiah*. Upon this the *Roman* Forces were raiſed, and beſieged a Place called *Bitter*, and deſtroyed it, with an incredible Number of the Rebellious *Jews*. This Deceiver was by the ſurviving *Jews* afterward called בר כוזיבא *Bar Coziba*, i. e. *the Son of a Lye*. This is ſaid by the *Jews* to have happened about fifty two Years after the Deſtruction of the *Jewiſh* Temple by *Titus*.

R. David Ganz Zem. David. Pag. 101. *Juchaſin* fol. 35.

So

So ſoon were they encreaſed, and returned to their Rebellion. Mighty Expectations were raiſed in the *Jews* upon the Appearance of this falſe *Chriſt*. He was cried up and applauded by a vaſt Multitude of deluded *Jews*: But he brought an incredible Deſtruction upon the whole Nation, and loſt his own Life. He was ſo far from delivering his People, that he was the occaſion of rendring the Condition of thoſe of them who ſurvived much worſe than it was before. For whereas before the *Jews* enjoyed the Liberty of living in their own Land, and enjoyed there a vaſt Number of Synagogues, for the Worſhip of God, they were after this debarred of this Liberty, and excluded from their own Land. We have many Teſtimonies to this purpoſe. *Adrian commanded that the Ears of the ſurviving* Jews *ſhould be cut off; and made a Law, that none of them ſhould for the future, though at a Diſtance, be admitted ſo much as to ſee* Jeruſalem. *Euſebius* relates much to the ſame purpoſe from *Ariſto Pellæus*. They were now prohibited ſo much as to come into their Land, and forced to wander about into Countries to which they did not belong. After this the *Jews* met with great Reproaches, and Hardſhips, were ſcorned and ill uſed; and ſuffered

Gr. *Abulpharai, Hiſt. Dynaſt.* p. 77.

Hiſt. l. 4. c. 6.

fered for their Folly and too great Credulity.

II. Another great Impoſtor appeared in the Days of *Theodoſius* the Younger, in the Year 434. This *Jew* was of *Crete*, now called *Candia*; and is commonly known by the Title of *Moſes Cretenſis*. He pretended a Divine Miſſion, and that he was ſent from Heaven, to the *Jews* who were in that Iſland, to make a Paſſage for them through the Sea, as *Moſes* of old had done by the *Iſraelites*. He went to all the Cities of that Iſland, and gained Belief of the *Jews*, who gave him credit. He promiſed them to carry them into their own Land, and to dry up the Sea which lay in their way. The *Jews* believed him ſo far as to lay aſide their Buſineſs, and to leave their Goods to any one that would lay hold of them. The Impoſtor appointed them a Day, and when the Time was come, they met together, and he march'd before them to the Sea-ſide. They followed him Univerſally, with their Wives and Children, to a Promontory upon the Sea-ſide. He commanded them thence to throw themſelves into the Sea; and was in that obeyed by thoſe who had gotten to the Top of the Promontory, who forthwith periſhed by the Rock, or in the Waters.

ters. Many more, it hath been ſaid, had periſhed, had it not been for ſome Fiſhermen, and ſome *Chriſtian* Traders who were at hand. They ſaved ſome out of the Waters who were ready to periſh, and hindred others from throwing themſelves into the Sea. The *Jews* hereupon condemn'd themſelves for their Folly, and ſought to deſtroy the Impoſtor, but he eſcaped their Hands: And, which was the greateſt Advantage, ſome of them hereupon renounced their *Judaiſm*, and turned *Chriſtians*. *V. Socrat. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 5. c. 37.*

III. As the laſt Impoſtor pretended to be *Moſes*, ſo there followed another in the Days of the Emperour *Juſtin*, who profeſſed himſelf to be the Son of *Moſes*. The Name of this *Jew* was *Dunaan*: He went into a City of *Arabia Fælix*, and oppreſſed the *Chriſtians*, and among them *Arethas* the Biſhop: But he did not go long unpuniſhed for his Cruelty; he was taken Captive, and put to Death.

IV. In the Year 529 the *Jews* with the *Samaritans* in *Paleſtine* rebell'd, and endeavoured to ſhake off the *Roman* Yoke. They ſet over them one *Julian*, they crowned him, and armed themſelves to deſtroy the *Chriſtians*: And becauſe he ſuc-

ſucceeded in this Attempt, they owned him for the *Meſſias*; this Succeſs being among the *Jews* a *Mark* or Note of the true *Meſſias*. It was not long before the *Romans* oppoſed them, and deſtroyed an innumerable Company of them, together with their Captain or Leader.

V. In the Year 571 was *Mahomet*, that Grand Impoſtor, born into the World. I do not pretend that he was a *Jew*: However he may well be mentioned in this Place, as a falſe Prophet; and one that miſled the *Jews*, as well as others. For his Religion, it is indeed a Mixture: But there is a great deal of *Judaiſm* in it, as appears from their Practice, *viz.* Circumciſion, Waſhings, Polygamy, *&c.* Beſides, 'tis well known that a cunning *Jew* had a great hand in contriving the Impoſture: After all he profeſſed himſelf to be the *Meſſias*, which was promiſed in the Old Teſtament; and was by the deluded *Jews* owned as their *Meſſias*; of which we have ſeveral Teſtimonies collected by a late Learned Writer. To which I may add, that the *Jews* have too often, both of later Times, and from the beginning, renounced their own Religion, and embraced that of *Mahomet*. Upon which Conſiderations he may juſtly ſtand in the Catalogue

Joan. à Lent. Schediaſm. cap. 2.

logue of the Impoſtors which I am obliged to give an account of.

Another Impoſtor appeared in the Time of *Leo Iſaurus*, who profeſſed himſelf to be the *Meſſias*, in the Year 721. He was a *Syrian*: This Wretch was followed by the credulous *Jews*, and they were ſeduced by him. After this the *Jews* were in great affliction from the *Chriſtians*. I will not examine how it came to be ſo: But in great diſtreſs they were; and as it is natural for Men in that Caſe to wiſh for a Deliverer, ſo the *Jews* were very credulous when there appeared any ſhadow of ſuch an one: And after they had ſuffered very ſeverely, they were very eaſily impoſed upon. VI.

In the Year 1137 there appeared an Impoſtor in *France*, who profeſſed himſelf to be the *Meſſias*; who deluded the *Jews*, and brought deſtruction upon himſelf, and upon the *Jewiſh* People. VII.

In the Year 1138 another Impoſtor appeared in the Kingdom of *Perſia*, who profeſſed himſelf to be the *Meſſias*, and ſo far ſucceeded, as to get a great Number of *Jews* to follow him. He with his Numbers advanced towards the King of *Perſia*, VIII. *Shevet Jehud. verſ. per Gentium*, p. 169.

to

to wage War with him. The King was terrified with his Attempt: He called together the *Jews* which were in his Kingdom, and told them that if they did not divert this Impoſtor from invading his Kingdom, he would at once deſtroy them with their Wives and Children. Upon this the *Jews* apply themſelves to the Impoſtor, fall at his Feet, with Groans and Tears, beſeech him to forbear to proceed, and not to bring Deſtruction upon the *Jewiſh* Nation. The Impoſtor reply'd in this Manner, *I am come to ſave you, ye will not be ſaved: Whom do ye, Wretches, fear? Who can ſtand before my Face? The King of* Perſia *is formidable to you; I will make him fly at the very Sound of my Arms.* The *Jews* asked him by what Sign he could prove himſelf to be the *Meſſias*? He anſwered, he would prove it by his proſperous Succeſſes, and that there was need of no other Proof. The *Jews* reply'd, that many had pretended as much with ill Succeſs; upon which freedom he ſent them away in great Anger. Theſe poor *Jews* return to the Impoſtor the following Day, which they had ſet apart for Prayers and Faſting: They ſet before him their little Children, to mollifie him and bring him to ſome Meaſure of Compaſſion. Upon the ſight of them, he told them

them that out of Compaſſion to them he would forbear fighting the *Perſian* King, upon this Condition that he would defray all the Charge that he had been at in getting ſuch an Army together. Thus inſolent was this Impoſtor grown. Nor was this all: For when the *Jews* objected againſt this unreaſonable demand, that ſo great a Prince, as the King of *Perſia* was, ſhould ſtoop ſo low as to bear the Expences of his Army; the inſolent Impoſtor reply'd thus, *Let me no more hear ſuch words; otherwiſe, I will not only have my Expences, but beſides them I will not be ſatisfied with one Moyety of the* Perſian *Kingdom.* The *Jews* report the Impoſtor's Anſwer to the King; and the King complied with his unreaſonable Demand: But this was an occaſion of great Sufferings to the *Jews* afterwards, and coſt the Impoſtor his Head.

IX. In the ſame Century aroſe another Impoſtor, in *Corduba*, in the Kingdom of *Spain*: He deceived the credulous *Jews*, to the almoſt Univerſal Deſtruction of that Nation, throughout the Kingdom of *Spain*. He is mentioned by *Maimonides* in one of his Epiſtles.

Shevet. Jehud. p. 169. *Voſſii obſervationes in D. Gantz*, p. 294.

Mai-

X. *Maimonides* mentions another, who appeared, not long after the above-named Impoſtor, in the Kingdom of *Fez*; and ſo does *Solomon Ben Virga*, in the Place above cited.

XI. In the very ſame Year appeared another Deceiver, who pretended to be the Fore runner of the *Meſſias*; and he appeared in *Arabia*. The Hiſtory of this Impoſtor is related by *Maimonides* in one of his Epiſtles: I will give the Reader an account of what he relates on this occaſion. עמד ובו i. e. *There aroſe* (ſays he) *a certain Man, two and twenty Years ago, who profeſſed himſelf to be the Fore runner of the* Meſſias, *who was to prepare his way before his coming. He declared that the* Meſſias *would appear in the South. Many, both* Jews *and* Arabians, *flocked unto him. He went about the Mountains, and drew his Followers aſide, and frequently uſed theſe words:* Come with me and let us go forth to meet the *Meſſias*; for he hath ſent me unto you, to prepare the way before him. *Our Brethren of the South* (ſays *Maimonides*) *wrote to me largely, and acquainted me with his way and manner, and what alteration he made in the Prayers, and*

Maimon. Ep. ad Judæos Marſilienſes.

and what he ſaid to them, and related to me that they had ſeen his Miracles, and asked my opinion: Upon the whole matter and information from their writing, I found that he was a poor Man, unlearned (though he feared God) and of no Wiſdom; and that all he was ſaid to have done or made ſhew of was altogether falſe. He goes on and relates, that he wrote to the *Jews* on this occaſion, concerning the Subject of King *Meſſias*, of his Marks, and the Time of his appearing; and warns them that they ſhould admoniſh this Impoſtor, that he might not bring Deſtruction upon himſelf, and upon the *Jews*. He tells us that he was afterwards taken, and that his Adherents forſook him, and that he was brought before the *Arabian* King, who queſtioned him for what he had done. To whom the Impoſtor replied, *that he had ſpoken the Truth, and had acted by a Divine Commiſſion.* The King demanded a Sign or Miracle to confirm this Commiſſion. The Impoſtor replied in theſe words, *Cut off my Head and I will riſe again and live as before.* The King told him this would (if it happened as he ſaid) convince him and the reſt of Mankind, who would then believe his words. His Head was cut off, but he appeared no more, but brought great Da-

mage to the ſurviving *Jews*. This is a true Account of what *Maimonides* relates on this occaſion.

XII. The ſame Author mentions another *Jewiſh* Impoſtor, who appeared about the ſame Time beyond the River *Euphrates*, who pretended to be the *Meſſias*, and promiſed this Sign for proof of it, That whereas he was Leprous over Night, he would in the Morning be freed from that Diſtemper; but he failed in his Sign, and the poor *Jews* were ſo far from being delivered by him, that they ſoon fell into great Afflictions.

V. Maimon. Ep. de Auſtrali reg. apud Vorſtium. Shevet Jehuda. p. 169.

XIII. *Perſia* again is diſturbed with another Impoſtor, who profeſſed himſelf to be the long expected and much deſired *Meſſias*. He appeared about the Year 1174, to the very great Miſery of his Country-men the *Jews*.

XIV. Another appeared in *Moravia*, who pretended to be the *Meſſias*; his Name was *David Almuſſer*. He was a great *Cabbaliſt*, and endeavoured to hide himſelf from the King of the Country. But the King obliged the *Jews* of the Country to take the Impoſtor, and deliver him up, under a very ſevere Penalty: He was at length taken

taken and put to death, and the *Jews* underwent the Mulct of a very great Summ.

Solomon Ben Virga mentions another of theſe Impoſtors, but we are not ſo certain of the preciſe Time of his appearing. XV. *Shevet Jehud.* pag. 169.

Another famous Impoſtor aroſe alſo in *Perſia*, and profeſſed himſelf to be the *Meſſias*: He was called *David el David*, and otherwiſe *Alroi*. The *Jewiſh* Writers make a great mention of this falſe *Chriſt*, and from them I ſhall give an account of him. XVI.

Benjamin Tudelenſis gives us this Account of him, *viz.* That this *David Alroi* was of the City of *Amana*, and a Diſciple of *Haſdai*; that he was eminent for his Knowledge of the Law of *Moſes*, of the Conſtitutions, and of the *Talmud*, and all Exotick Sciences, and the *Arabick* Language and Writings, and not ignorant of Magical Books. He undertook to rebell againſt the King of *Perſia*, and to bring the *Jews* to *Jeruſalem*, and, as he pretended, to deliver them from the Yoke or Bondage of the *Gentiles*, and gained belief among the *Jews*, by certain Signs and falſe Miracles, which he wrought to confirm his *Itinerar. Benjamin*, p. 91.

Miſſion, upon which the *Jews* owned him for their *Meſſias*. The King of *Perſia* hearing of this, ſent for the Impoſtor; and he came to him without fear. The King asked him if he were the *King of the Jews?* He replied that he was. The King upon that put him in Priſon; from whence he in a little time eſcaped, and preſented himſelf again before the King; but in ſuch a Manner, as thoſe who were preſent with the King could not ſee him, they only heard his Voice. After this he made his eſcape after a very ſurprizing Manner: But was at laſt, by the Procurement of the King of *Perſia*, beheaded; and the *Jews* his Country-men were forced to pay a very great Summ, to pacifie the Wrath of the King.

Shevet Jehud. p. 162.

Solomon Ben Virga gives us alſo an Account of this Impoſtor, and calls him *David el David*. He tells that in that City where this Impoſtor appeared, there were no leſs than 1000 Families of the *Jews*: That the *Jews* paid a Tribute to the King of *Perſia*; that this *El David* was not only a Diſciple to *Haſdai*, but to another great Man, a Rector of the Academy of *Bagdad*, who was very skilfull in the *Talmudick* Learning, and the liberal Arts, and greatly vers'd in the Magical Books of the *Chaldees*. That this Impoſtor was very

very proud and inſolent, and reſolved to rebell againſt the *Perſian* King. That he perſwaded the *Jews* to take up Arms; and to gain Credit, he did ſome prodigious Works; which ſome imputed to his Magical Skill, others to Divine Aſſiſtance. That his Followers called him the *Meſſias*, and with Praiſes extolled him to the Heavens. The King was ſtartled at this, ſends for him, and examines him, before whom he owned himſelf to be the *Meſſias*; upon which he was impriſoned, and made his eſcape, as is related above. But after his Flight and wonderfull Paſſage over the Water, he was at length killed by his Father-in-Law, and his Head carried to the *Perſian* King.

R. David Gantz, gives us alſo a ſhort Account of this Impoſtor, by the Title of *David el David*; and refers us to the *Shevet Jehuda* above-mentioned for a larger Hiſtory of him. *Zemach David.* p. 135.

It muſt be confeſſed that the two laſt *Jewiſh* Writers make this Impoſtor to be the ſame whom *Maimonides* mentions in his Epiſtle, and of whom I have given an Account, *Numb.* XI. That, for what I can ſee, may be their Miſtake: But I ſhall not ſpend any Time about that Enquiry, nor do I think it worth my while. I am ſure the Account which is given

of *El David* by the *Jewiſh* Hiſtorians, cannot agree with the Relation of *Maimonides*.

It is obſerved that after this the *Jews* were greatly afflicted and oppreſſed in the ſeveral Countries where they lived; and conſequently, were very deſirous of a Deliverer. Hence it was that they were very prone to believe Impoſtors and Deceivers, for we are naturally prone to believe what we mightily deſire.

XVII. In the Year 1222 an Impoſtor appeared in *Germany* as King *Meſſias*, whom the *Jews* called the Son of *David*. And in the ſame Year the *Jews* about *Worms* in *Germany* expected one to be born of a young Woman that was then big with Child: But ſo it happened (againſt the vehement Deſire and Expectation of the *Jews*) the young Woman was delivered of a Daughter. For the truth of this a late Writer hath produced ſeveral Teſtimonies; to whom I refer the Reader.

Joh à Lent, Sckediaſm. c. 4. S. 2.

XVIII. About the Year 1497, in the Days of *Ferdinand* King of *Spain*, another Impoſtor appeared, deluding the poor *Jews* with the hope of their *Meſſias*. He was called *Iſmael Sophus*, and with a Company of miſerable Wretches that followed him, with

J. à Lent. Ibid.

with Succeſs prevailed in *Media*, *Parthia*, *Perſia*, *Meſopotamia* and *Armenia*, inſo much that the *Jews* flattered themſelves that he would be their *Meſſias*, and great Deliverer: But he was far from giving them any help.

In the Year 1500 another Impoſtor appeared in *Germany*, pretending himſelf to be the *Meſſias*: His Name was *Lemlem* a *German Jew* of a Principality of *Auſtria*. The *Jews* ſay he profeſſed himſelf to be the Fore-runner of *Meſſias*. XIX.

David Gantz gives us this Account of him, *viz.* That he foretold the Coming of the *Meſſias* would happen that Year; that all the diſperſed *Jews* believed him, and many of the *Gentiles* alſo. He pulled down his Oven where he was wont to bake his Cakes againſt the Paſſeover, being confident that the following Year he ſhould bake them in the Holy Land. He adds that *R. Eliezer* told him, that he did not only foretell what is ſaid of him, but gave ſome Sign or Miracle to prove his Prediction. Thus he. *Zemach David*, p. 150.

About the Year 1534, another Impoſtor appeared in *Spain*, and gave out himſelf to be the *Meſſias*; but with very ill Suc- XX. *J. à Leat. ubi ſupra.*

Succeſs, being burn'd for his Impoſture, by the Command of *Charles* the Fifth.

XXI. About the Year 1615, another falſe *Chriſt* appeared in *Eaſt-India*, and was followed by the *Portugueſe Jews*.

J. à Lent. Ibid.

XXII. About the Year 1624 and 1625 there appeared another Impoſtor, who pretended to be the *Meſſias*, of the Family of *David*, and of the Line of *Nathan*. He appeared in the *Low Countries*: He gave out that he would overthrow the Kingdom of *Anti-Chriſt*, and of the *Turk*; and that *Rome* ſhould be overturned. He was a great *Enthuſiaſt*, as appears from the Accounts given of him.

J. à Lent. Ibid.

XXIII. I proceed to another Impoſtor who appeared in the Year 1666. This was a Year of great Expectation, and ſome wonderfull thing was looked for by many. This was a fit time for an Impoſtor to ſet up; and accordingly lying Reports were carried about. 'Twas told about, that great Multitudes marched from unknown Parts into the remote Deſerts of *Arabia*; and they were ſuppoſed to be the *Ten Tribes* of *Iſrael*, who have been diſperſed for many Ages. That a Ship was arrived

J. Hiſtory of the 3 Impoſtors publiſhed by *J. E.* A.D. 1669.

arrived in the North-parts of *Scotland* with Sails and Cordage of Silk; that the Mariners ſpake nothing but *Hebrew*; that on the Sails was this *Motto*, THE TWELVE TRIBES OF *ISRAEL*. Thus were credulous Men poſſeſſed at that Time.

Then it was that *Sabatai Sevi* appeared at *Smyrna*, and profeſſed himſelf to be the *Meſſias*. He promiſed the *Jews* Deliverance and a proſperous Kingdom. This which he promiſed they firmly believed; the *Jews* now attended to no buſineſs, diſcourſed of nothing but of their Return. They believed *Sabatai* to be the *Meſſias*, as firmly as we *Chriſtians* believe any Article of Faith. A Right Reverend Perſon then in *Turkey*, told me, that meeting with a *Jew* of his Acquaintance at *Aleppo*, he asked the *Jew* what he thought of *Sabatai*. The *Jew* replied that he believed him to be the *Meſſias*, and that he was ſo far of that belief, that if he ſhould prove an Impoſtor, *he would then turn Chriſtian*. It will be very fit I ſhould be very particular in this Relation, becauſe the Hiſtory is ſo very ſurprizing and remarkable; and we have an Account of it from thoſe who were then in *Turkey*, and are now alive. I am ſo well ſatisfied as to the Facts, that I dare vouch for the Truth of the Relation, and appeal for the Truth of it to very

very many Perſons of great Credit, who are now alive.

Sabatai Sevi was the Son of *Mordechai Sevi*, a mean *Jew* in *Smyrna*. *Sabatai* was very bookiſh, and arrived to a great skill in the *Hebrew* Learning. He was the Author of a New Doctrine; and for it was expelled the City. He went thence to *Salonichi* (of Old called *Theſſalonica*) where he married a very handſome Woman, but was divorced from her. Then he travelled into the *Morea*, then to *Tripoli*, *Gaza* and *Jeruſalem*. By the way he picked up a third Wife. At *Jeruſalem* he began to reform the *Jews* Conſtitutions, and aboliſh one of their ſolemn Faſts, and communicated his Deſign of profeſſing himſelf the *Meſſias* to one *Nathan*: He was pleaſed with it, and ſets up for his *Elias*, or Fore-runner, and took on him to aboliſh all the *Jewiſh* Faſts, as not beſeeming, when the Bridegroom was now come. *Nathan* propheſies that the *Meſſias* ſhould appear before the Grand Seignior (in leſs than two Years) and take from him his Crown, and lead him in Chains.

At *Gaza*, *Sabatai* preached Repentance (together with a Faith in himſelf) ſo effectually, that the People gave themſelves up to their Devotions and Alms. The Noiſe of this *Meſſias* began to fill all Places.

Places. *Sabatai* now reſolves for *Smyrna*, and then for *Conſtantinople*. *Nathan* writes to him from *Damaſcus*; and thus he begins his Letter: *To the King, our King, Lord of our Lords, who gathers the diſperſed of* Iſrael, *who redeems our Captivity, the Man elevated to the Heighth of all Sublimity, the* Meſſias *of the God of* Jacob, *the True* Meſſias, *the Cæleſtial Lyon*, Sabatai Sevi.

And now thro'-out *Turkey* the *Jews* were in great Expectation of glorious Times: They now were devout and penitent, that they might not obſtruct the good which they hoped for. Some faſted ſo long that they were famiſhed to Death; others buried themſelves in the Earth till their Limbs grew ſtiff; ſome would endure melted Wax dropped on their Fleſh; ſome rowled in Snow; others in a cold Seaſon would put themſelves into cold Water; and many whipped themſelves. Buſineſs was laid aſide, Superfluities of Houſhold Utenſils were ſold; the poor were provided for by immenſe Contributions.

Sabatai comes to *Smyrna*, where he was adored by the People, though the *Chacham* contradicted him; for which he was removed from his Office. There he in Writing ſtiles himſelf *The Only, and Firſt-*

Firſt-born Son of God the Meſſias, *the Saviour of* Iſrael. And though he met with ſome Oppoſition, yet he prevailed there at laſt, to that Degree, that ſome of his Followers propheſied, and fell into ſtrange Extaſies: Four hundred Men and Women propheſied of his growing Kingdom; and young Infants, who could hardly ſpeak, would plainly pronounce *Sabatai*, *Meſſias*, and the *Son of God*. The People were for a Time poſſeſſed, and Voices heard from their Bowels; ſome fell into Trances, foamed at the Mouth, recounted their future Proſperity, their Viſions of the *Lyon* of *Judah*, and the Triumphs of *Sabatai*; *All which* (ſays the Relator) *were certainly true, being Effects of Diabolical Deluſions, as the* Jews *themſelves have ſince confeſſed unto me.*

Now the Impoſtor ſwells and aſſumes. Whereas the *Jews* in their Synagogues, were wont to pray for the *Grand Seignior*, he orders thoſe Prayers to be forborn for the future, thinking it an indecent thing to pray for him who was ſhortly to be his Captive; and inſtead of praying for the *Turkiſh* Emperour, he appoints Prayers for himſelf, as another Author relates: And (as my Author goes on) he elected Princes to govern the *Jews* in their March towards the Holy Land, and to miniſter

à Lent.

Ju-

Juſtice to them when they ſhould be poſſeſſed of it. Theſe Princes were as follows,

Isaac Silvera,	King *David,*
Solomon Lagnado,	was *Solomon,*
Solomon Lagnado, Jun.	named *Zovah,*
Joſeph Cohen,	*Uzziah,*
Moſes Galente,	*Joſaphat,*
Daniel Pinto,	*Hilkiah,* or rather *Hezekiah,*
Abraham Scandale,	*Jotham,*
Mokiah Gaſpar,	*Zedekiah,*
Abraham Leon,	*Achaz,*
Ephraim Arditi,	*Joram,*
Salom Carmona,	*Achab,*
Mataſſia Aſcheneſi,	*Aſa,*
Meir Alcaira,	*Reboboam,*
Jacob Loxes,	*Ammon,*
Mordechai Jeſſerun,	*Jehojachim,*
Chaim Inegna,	*Jeroboam,*
Joſeph Scavillo,	*Abia,*
Conor Nehemias,	*Zerobabel,*
Joſeph Del Caire,	*Jotas,*
Elcukin Schavit,	*Amaſia,*
Abraham Ruvio,	*Joſia,*
Elias Sevi,	King of the King of Kings.
Elias Azar,	*His* Vice-King.
Joſeph Zevi,	*The* K. of the Kings of *Judah.*
Joſeph Inernuch,	*His* Vice-King.

Theſe

Theſe were Men well known in the City of *Smyrna* at that Time. The People now were preſſing to ſee ſome Miracle to confirm their Faith, and convince the *Gentiles*. Here the Impoſtor was puzzled; though any jugling Trick would have ſerved their Turn. But the credulous People ſupplied this Defect. When *Sabatai* was before the *Cadi* (or Juſtice of Peace) ſome affirmed they ſaw a Pillar of Fire between him and the *Cadi*; and after ſome had affirmed it, others were ready to ſwear it, and did ſwear it alſo; and this was preſently believed by the *Jews* of that City. He that did not now believe him to be the *Meſſias*, was to be ſhunn'd as an excommunicate Perſon. The Impoſtor declares now that he was called of God to ſee *Conſtantinople*, where he had much to do. He ſhips himſelf, to that end, in a *Turkiſh Saick*, in *Jan.* 1666. He had a long and troubleſome Voyage: He had not *power over the Sea and Winds.* The *Vizier*, upon the News, ſends for him, and confines him to a loathſome Priſon. The *Jews* pay him their Viſits; and they of this City are now as much infatuated as thoſe of *Smyrna*. They forbid Traffick, and refuſed to pay their Debts. Some of our *Engliſh* Merchants, not knowing how to recover their Debts from

from the *Jews*, took this occaſion to viſit *Sabatai*, and make their Complaints to him, againſt his Subjects; whereupon he wrote this following Letter to the *Jews*:

TO You of the Nation of the Jews, *who expect the Appearance of the* Meſſias, *and the Salvation of* Iſrael, *Peace without End. Whereas we are informed that you are indebted to ſeveral of the* Engliſh *Nation, it ſeemeth right unto us to order you to make ſatisfaction to theſe your juſt Debts; which if you refuſe to do, and not obey us herein, Know you that then you are not to enter with us into our Joys and Dominions.*

Sabatai remained a Priſoner in *Conſtantinople* by the Space of two Months. The Grand *Vizier*, deſigning for *Candia*, thought it not ſafe to leave him in the City, during the Grand *Seignior*'s Abſence and his own. He therefore removed him to the *Dardanelli*; a better Air indeed, but yet out of the way; and conſequently, importing leſs Danger to the City: Which occaſioned the *Jews* to conclude, that the *Turks* could not, or durſt not take away his Life; which had (they concluded) been the ſureſt way to have removed all Jealouſie.

The

The *Jews* flocked in great Numbers to the Caſtle where he was a Priſoner; not only thoſe that were near, but from *Poland*, *Germany*, *Legorn*, *Venice*, and other Places: They received *Sabatai*'s Bleſſing, and Promiſes of Advancement. The *Turks* made uſe of this Confluence; they raiſed the Price of their Lodgings and Proviſions, and put their Price upon thoſe who deſired to ſee *Sabatai*, for their Admittance. This Profit ſtopped their Mouths, and no Complaints were for this Cauſe ſent to *Adrianople*.

Sabatai, in this Confinement, appoints the Manner of celebrating his own Nativity. He commands the *Jews* to keep it on the ninth Day of the Month *Ab*, and to make it a Day of great Joy, to celebrate it with pleaſing Meats and Drinks, with Illuminations and Muſick. He obligeth them to acknowledge the Love of God, in giving them that Day of *Conſolation*, for the *Birth of their King* Meſſias, Sabatai Sevi, *his Servant and Firſt-born Son in Love*.

Serm. on *Zechariah* 7. 5.

I only obſerve, by the way, the Inſolence of this Impoſtor. This Day was a ſolemn Day of Faſting among the *Jews* formerly, as I have ſhewed elſewhere, in Memory of the burning of their Temple by the *Chaldees*: Several other ſad things hap-

happened in this Month, as the *Jews* obſerve; that then, and upon the ſame Day, the *ſecond* Temple was deſtroyed; and that in this Month it was decreed in the Wilderneſs that the *Iſraelites* ſhould not enter into *Canaan*, &c. *Sabatai* was born on this Day; and therefore the Faſt muſt be turned into a Feaſt: Whereas, in truth, it had been well for the *Jews* he had not been born at all; and much better for himſelf, as will appear from what follows. But I return to my Author.

The *Jews* of the City paid *Sabatai Sevi* great reſpect. They decked their Synagogues with *S. S.* in Letters of Gold, and made for him, in the Wall, a Crown; they attributed the ſame Titles and Prophecies to him which we apply to our Saviour.

He was alſo during this Impriſonment viſited by Pilgrims from all Parts, that had heard his Story. Among whom *Nehemiah Cohen* from *Poland* was one, a Man of great Learning in the *Kabbala*, and Eaſtern Tongues; who deſired a Conference with *Sabatai*, and at the Conference maintained that, according to the Scripture, there ought to be a Two-fold *Meſſias*; one the Son of *Ephraim*, a poor and deſpiſed Teacher of the Law; the other the Son of *David*, to be a Conque-

rour. *Nehemiah* was content to be the former, *viz.* the Son of *Ephraim*, and to leave the Glory and Dignity of the Latter to *Sabatai*. *Sabatai* (for what appears) did not miſlike this. But here lay the Ground of the Quarrel: *Nehemiah* taught that the Son of *Ephraim* ought to be the Fore-runner of the Son of *David*, and to uſher him in: And *Nehemiah* accuſed *Sabatai* of too great forwardneſs, in appearing as the Son of *David*, before the Son of *Ephraim* had led him the way. *Sabatai* could not brook this Doctrine; for he might fear that the Son of *Ephraim*, who was to lead the way, might pretend to be the Son of *David*, and ſo leave him in the lurch; and therefore he excluded him from any part or ſhare in this Matter; which was the Occaſion of the Ruin of *Sabatai*, and all his glorious Deſigns.

Nehemiah being diſappointed, goes to *Adrianople*, and informs the great Miniſters of State againſt *Sabatai*, as a lewd and dangerous Perſon to the Government, and that it was neceſſary to take him out of the way: The Grand *Seignior* being informed of this, ſends for *Sabatai*; who, much dejected, appears before him: The Grand *Seignior* requires a Miracle, and chooſes one himſelf, and 'twas this; that *Sabatai* ſhould be ſtripped naked, and ſet up

up as a Mark for his Archers to shoot at; and if the Arrows did not pierce his Flesh, he would own him to be the *Messias*. *Sabatai* had not Faith enough to bear up under so great a Trial. The Grand *Seignior* let him know that he would forthwith impale him, and that the Stake was prepared for him, unless he would turn *Turk*. Upon which he consented to turn *Mahometan*, to the great Confusion of the *Jews*. And yet some of the *Jews* were so vain as to affirm, that it was not *Sabatai* himself, but his shadow, that professed the Religion, and was seen in the Habit, of a *Turk*: So great was their Obstinacy and Infidelity; as if it were a thing impossible to convince these deluded and infatuated Wretches.

After all this, several of the *Jews* continued to use the Forms (in their publick Worship) prescribed by this *Mahometan-Messias*; which obliged the Principal *Jews* of *Constantinople* to send to the Synagogue of *Smyrna*, to forbid them this practice: The Letter is to be seen in my Author, with the Names of those who wrote it. P. 91. &c.

During these things, the *Jews*, instead of minding their Trade and Traffick, filled their Letters with News of *Sabatai*, their *Messias*, and his wonderfull Works. They reported that when the Grand *Seig-*

nior ſent to take him, he cauſed all the Meſſengers, that were ſent, to die; and that when other *Janizaries* were ſent, they all fell dead by a word of his Mouth; and being requeſted to do it, that he cauſed them to revive again: They added, that tho' the Priſon where *Sabatai* lay was barr'd and faſten'd with ſtrong Iron-locks, yet was he ſeen to walk through the Streets with a numerous Train. That the Shackles which were upon his Neck and Feet did not only fall off, but were turned into Gold, with which *Sabatai* gratified his Followers. Upon the Fame of theſe things, the *Jews* of *Italy* ſent Legates to *Smyrna*, to inquire into the truth of theſe Matters. When theſe Legates arrived at *Smyrna*, they heard of the News that *Sabatai* was turned *Turk*, to their very great Confuſion: But going to viſit the Brother of *Sabatai*, he endeavoured to perſwade them that *Sabatai* was ſtill the true *Meſſias*; that it was not *Sabatai* that went about in the Habit of a *Turk*, but his *Angel* or *Spirit*; that his Body was taken into Heaven, and ſhould be ſent down again when God ſhould think it a fit Seaſon. They added, that *Nathan* (his Fore-runner) who had wrought many Miracles, would ſoon be at *Smyrna*; that he would reveal hidden things to them,

them, and confirm them. But this *Elias* was not ſuffered to come into *Smyrna*; and though the Legates ſaw him elſewhere, they received no ſatisfaction from him at all.

There appeared another Impoſtor in the Year 1682, one *Rabbi Mordechai*, a *Jew* of *Germany*, a Man famous among his Country-men for his Learning, and auſtere kind of Life: He was alſo much cried up for his Prophecies, which he uttered, about five Years before, at *Prague* and other Places. He was a very ſharp Reprover of Vice, and was, for that reaſon, commonly called *Mochiah*, i. e. the *Reprover*. He was ſo vain as to profeſs himſelf to be the *Meſſias*; and not only to require the *Jews* to ſalute him as ſuch, but, upon the Matter, to adore him. The *Italian Jews* gave him Credit, and ſo did many of the *Jews* in *Germany* alſo, whither he came out of *Italy*. We are told that he was mightily careſſed in *Italy*, and received for the *Meſſias*; though the *Jews* of that Place, after they ſaw their Errour, did not care to own him. A certain *Jew* that by order of the *Jews* called him into *Italy*, tells us, that upon converſing with him, he found him to be an Inchanter and very ſilly; that he there- XXIV. *J. à Leut.*

upon warned the *Jews* not to believe him: Upon which the credulous *Jews* were ſo enraged that they treated their Monitor very malitiouſly, and diſmiſſed him from the Place of his Abode. They withall threatned him very ſeverely, if he durſt ſpeak evil any more of their *Meſſias*: That this *Jew* continuing to diſparage this Impoſtor, the *Italian Jews* were ſo enraged, that they endeavoured to caſt him out of the Place where he was ſetled, and declared that whoever ſhould do him miſchief, or bear falſe Witneſs againſt this Perſon, who defamed their *Meſſias*, ſhould be eſteemed guiltleſs.

Thus I have given a very ſhort Account of the *Falſe Chriſts*, who have appeared in the ſeveral Ages of the World. It remains now that I repreſent to the Reader, what this concerns my preſent Argument, and what are the Advantages of ſuch an Account as this. Now the Uſefulneſs of this ſhort Hiſtory appears in the following particulars.

1. This confirms our Lord's Prediction, who did foretell that there would appear Deceivers and falſe *Chriſts*, and lets the *Jews* know that they would be deceived by them, *John* 5. 43. Thoſe words of *Jeſus*, we find, have been often fulfilled: And the Knowledge of it con-

confirms us in the Belief that *Jeſus* was a true Prophet: And this is one great Advantage we receive from the fore-going Hiſtory. I have ſhewed before that what our Saviour fore-told did come to paſs, and have given unexceptionable Proofs of it; and made it appear, that whereas *Moſes* is received as a true Prophet, becauſe what he predicted did come to paſs, the *Jews* have the ſame and far greater reaſon to believe that *Jeſus* is ſo likewiſe. And what I have offered before to this purpoſe, will receive a farther Confirmation from what hath been related above. The *Jews* have believed thoſe who came in their own Name, though they did refuſe *Jeſus* who came in the Name of God. They have believed Impoſtors to their own Deſtruction, but refuſed *Jeſus* who came to ſave them. They have been (which is very ſurprizing) at once the moſt *incredulous* and the moſt *credulous* Perſons upon the Face of the Earth; hardly brought to believe the Truth, and very prone to believe a Lye.

2. We may learn of what great uſe *Miracles* are, to beget Faith in us. *Moſes* wrought many in *Egypt* to prove his *Divine Miſſion*; but they are not to be compared with thoſe which *Jeſus* wrought, as I have ſhowed before. But here theſe

Impoſtors failed; though this was expected from them by their own People, and by the *Heathens* alſo, and ſome of the Impoſtors attempted it. *Maimonides* does affirm that the *Meſſias* ſhall not work *Miracles*. He is ſingular in that Opinion, and he ſets up for it to undermine the Belief of *Chriſtians*. I have elſewhere expoſed that Opinion of his: And it is evident from what has been related before that it is deſtitute of any ground. The Miracles which *Jeſus* wrought were a mighty Confirmation of his Doctrine; as thoſe which *Moſes* wrought were of his Divine Miſſion. But theſe Impoſtors were not able to beget Faith in their Followers this way; which was highly neceſſary when they pretended to be ſent by God.

3. We may learn how vain the *Jews* are, and how little to be credited; eſpecially when they diſcourſe of their *Meſſias*, and the Time of his Appearance, and the End of their Captivity. We ſee how often they have been deceived, and baffled in their Hopes. And yet it is very certain that ſome weak *Chriſtians* have been too eaſily drawn aſide to liſten to their Dreams. One would think the *Jews* ſhould by this Time bethink themſelves. The former Account ought to have that Influence upon them: And yet what hath been

been ſaid before is not all that can be produced to ſhew the Vanity of the *Jewiſh* People. We have ſeveral other Accounts of them that are much to their Confuſion. I will not think much to mention ſome of them.

And *Firſt*, I will give an Account of the Deſtruction and Baniſhment of the *Jews* out of the Empire of *Perſia*; an Account of which we have from a very good hand; and the Account is as follows. *V.* Hiſtory of three Impoſtors, by *J. E. Lon.* 1669. p. 114.

In the Reign of the Famous *Abas*, *Sophy* of *Perſia*, and Grandfather to the preſent Emperour, (ſays my A.) the Nation being low, and ſomewhat exhauſted of Inhabitants, it entred into the Mind of this Prince, to ſeek ſome expedient for the Revival and Improvement of Trade, and by all Manner of Privileges and Immunities to encourage other contiguous Nations to negotiate and trade amongſt them: And this Project he fortified with ſo many Immunities, and uſed them ſo well who came, that repairing from all Parts to his Country, in a ſhort Time the whole Kingdom was filled with Multitudes of the moſt induſtrious People and Strangers, that any way bordered on him.

It happened that amongſt thoſe who came, innumerable Flocks of *Jews* ran thi-

thither, from all their Diſperſions in the *Eaſt*; attracted by the Gain which they Univerſally make where-ever they ſet footing. And it was not many Years but they had ſo impoveriſhed the reſt, and eſpecially the natural Subjects of *Perſia*, that the Clamour of it reached to the Ears of the Emperour: And indeed it was intolerable; for even his own Exchequer began to be ſenſible of it, as well as his People's Purſes, and Eſtates, which they had almoſt devoured.

How to remedy this Inconvenience, without giving Umbrage to the reſt of thoſe profitable Strangers now ſettled in his Dominions, by falling ſeverely upon the *Jews* on the ſudden, he long conſulted; and for that End called to his Advice his chief Miniſters of State, the *Mufti*, and Expounders of the Law: After much diſpute, 'twas at laſt found, that the *Jews* had already long ſince forfeited their lives, by the very Text of the *Alcoran*; where it is expreſſed, that if within ſix hundred Years from the Promulgation of that Religion, they did not Univerſally come in, and profeſs the *Mahometan Faith*, they ſhould be deſtroyed. The zealous Emperour would immediately have put this Edict in Execution; but by the Interceſſion of the *Mufti* and the reſt of the Doctors,

'twas

'twas thought fit to ſuſpend it for the preſent: But that theſe growing Evils might in time have a Period, His Majeſty commanded that all the *Chachams*, *Rabbins*, and Chief amongſt the *Jews* ſhould immediately appear before his Tribunal, and make anſwer to ſome Objections that were to be propounded to them.

The *Jews* being accordingly convened, the *Sophy* examines them about ſeveral Paſſages of their Law; and particularly concerning the Prophet *Moſes*, and thoſe Rites of his which ſeem'd to have been ſo long annihilated amongſt them, ſince the Coming of *Iſai* (for ſo they call *Jeſus*) after whom they pretended their *Mahomet* was to take place, and all other Predictions to determine.

The *Jews* much terrified with the Manner of theſe Interrogatories, and dubious what the meaning and drift of them might ſignifie, told the Emperour, that for *Chriſt*, they did not believe in him; but that they expected a *Meſſiah* of their own to come, who ſhould by his miraculous Power deliver them from their Oppreſſours, and ſubdue all the World to his Obedience.

At this reply, the *Sophy* appeared to be much incenſed: How! ſays he, Do you not then believe *Chriſt*, of whom our

our very *Alcoran* makes ſo honourable mention? As that he was the *Spirit* of *God*, ſent down from him, and returning to him, *&c.* If *we* believe him, why do not *you?* What ſay you for your ſelves, you incredulous Wretches? The confounded *Jews*, perceiving the Emperour thus provoked, immediately proſtrated themſelves on the Ground, humbly ſupplicating him to take pity on his Slaves, who acknowledged themſelves altogether unable to diſpute with His Majeſty; that for the *Chriſtians*, they ſeem'd indeed to them to be groſs Idolaters; Men who did not worſhip God, but a Crucified Malefactor and Deceiver: Which ſtill the more diſpleaſed the *Sophy*; not enduring they ſhould ſo blaſpheme a Perſon for whom their *Alcoran* had ſo great a Reverence. However, for the preſent, he diſſembles his Reſentment: 'Tis well (ſays he) you do not believe the God of the *Chriſtians*: But, tell me, What think you of our great Prophet *Mahomet?* This Demand exceedingly perplexed them, not knowing what to reply: And, indeed, it was contriv'd on purpoſe, that convincing them of Blaſphemy (as they thought it) againſt their Prophet, the *Sophy* might find a ſpecious and legal Pretence to ruine and deſtroy *them*, without giving any Jea-

Jealouſie or Suſpicion to the reſt of the Strangers, who were trafficking in his Country, of ſeveral other Religions, but who were not in the leaſt obnoxious to his Diſpleaſure.

After a long Pauſe, and ſecret Conference with one another, it was at laſt reſolved among them, that though they had denied *Chriſt*, they would yet ſay nothing poſitively againſt *Mahomet*: Therefore they told the *Emperour*, that though their Religion forbad them to believe any Prophet ſave *Moſes*, yet they did not hold *Mahomet* for a falſe Propher, inaſmuch as he was deſcended of *Iſhmael*, the Son of *Abraham*, and that they deſired to remain His Majeſty's humble Vaſſals and Slaves, and crav'd his Pity on them.

The *Sophy* eaſily perceiving the cunning and wary Subterfuge of their Reply, told them this ſhould not ſerve their turn; that they were a People of diſſolute Principles, and that under Pretence of their long expected *Meſſiah*, they perſiſted in a falſe Religion, and kept off from proſelyting to the true Belief; and therefore requir'd of them to ſet a poſitive Time, when their *Meſſiah* was to appear; for that he would ſupport them no longer, who had impos'd on the World, and cheated

ed his People now ſo many Years: But withall aſſuring them, that he would both pardon and protect them for the time they ſhould aſſign, provided they did not go about to abuſe him by any incompetent Procraſtinations, but aſſign the Year preciſely of his Coming; when, if accordingly he did not appear, they were Sons of Death, and ſhould all of them either renounce their Faith, or be certainly deſtroyed, and their Eſtates confiſcated.

The poor *Jews*, though infinitely confounded with this unexpected Demand, and Reſolution of the *Sophy*, after a ſecond Conſultation among themſelves (which the *Emperour* granted) contriv'd to give him this Anſwer: That according to their Books and Prophecies their *Meſſiah* ſhould infallibly appear within ſeventy Years; prudently (as they thought) believing, that either the *Emperour* or they ſhould be all of them dead before that time; and that in the *interim*, ſuch Alterations might emerge, as all this would be forgotten or averted; and that at the worſt, a good Summ of Money would reverſe the Sentence: But that ſomething was of Neceſſity to be promiſed to ſatisfie his preſent humorous Zeal.

The

The *Emperour* accepts of the Answer, and immediately causes it to be recorded in form of a solemn Stipulation between them: That in case there were no News of their *Messiah* within the seventy Years assign'd (to which of Grace he added five more) they should either turn *Mahometans*, or their whole Nation utterly be destroyed throughout *Persia*, and their Substance confiscated: But with this Clause also inserted, that if their *Messiah* did appear within that Period, the *Emperour* would himself be obliged to become a *Jew*, and make all his Subjects so with him. This, drawn (as we said) in form of an Instrument, was reciprocally sign'd and seal'd on both Parts, and the *Jews* for the present dismiss'd; with the Payment yet of no less than two Millions of Gold (as my Author affirms) for the Favour of this long Indulgence.

Since the Time of this *Emperour Abas*, to the present *Sophy* now reigning, (says my Author) there are not only these seventy Years past, but one hundred and fifteen expired: During which time the *Persians* have been so molested by the *Turks*, and by continual War in the *East-Indies*, &c. that the succeeding Princes no more minded this Stipulation of their Predecessours; till (says he) by a wonderfull

derfull Accident in the Reign of the Second *Abas*, Father of him who now governs, a Perſon extreamly curious of Antiquities, ſearching one Day amongſt the Records of his Palace, there was found this Writing in the Journal of his Father, intimating what had ſo ſolemnly paſs'd between him, and the *Chiefs* of the *Jews*, in the Name of their whole Nation.

Upon this the *Sophy* inſtantly ſummons a Council, produces the Inſtrument before them, and requires their Advice, what was to be done; and the rather, for that there began now to be great Whiſpers, and ſome Letters had been written to them from Merchants out of *Turkey*, of the Motions of a pretended *Meſſiah*; which was the Famous *Sabatai*. This ſo wrought with the Emperour and his Council, that with one Voice, and without longer Pauſe, they immediately conclude upon the Deſtruction of the *Jews*; and that this wicked Generation of Impoſtors and Oppreſſours of his People were no longer to be indured upon the Earth.

In order to this Reſolution, Proclamations are iſſued out and publiſhed to the People, and to all that were Strangers and Inhabitants amongſt them, impowering them to fall immediately upon the

Jews

Jews in all the *Perſian* Dominions; and to put to the Sword, Man, Woman, and Child, but ſuch as ſhould forthwith turn to the *Mahometan Belief*; and to ſeize on their Goods and Eſtates, without any Remorſe or Pity.

This cruel and bloudy Arreſt was accordingly put in Execution, firſt at *Iſpahan*, and ſuddenly afterwards in all the reſt of the Cities and Towns of *Perſia*. Happy was he that could eſcape the Fury of the inraged People, who by Virtue of the publick Sentence, grounded upon the declared Stipulation, and now more encouraged by the dwindling of their pretended *Meſſiah*, had no commiſeration on them, but ſlew and made havock of them, where-ever they could find a *Jew* through all their vaſt Territories; falling upon the Spoil, and continuing the Carnage to their utter Extermination. Nor did the Perſecution ceaſe for ſeveral Years, beginning from about ſixty three till ſixty ſix, at *Iſpahan*, the Cities and Countries of *Seyra*, *Ghelan*, *Humadan*, *Ardan*, *Tauris*, and, in ſumm, throughout the whole Empire, without ſparing either Sex or Age; excepting (as was ſaid) ſuch as turn'd *Mahometans*, or eſcaped through the Deſerts into *Turkey*, *India*, and other far diſtant Regions; and that without hopes of

ever Re-eſtabliſhing themſelves for the future in *Perſia*, the hatred of that People being ſo deadly and irreconcileable againſt them. And, in truth, this late Action and Miſcarriage of their pretended *Meſſiah*, has rendred them ſo Univerſally deſpicable, that nothing but a determined Obſtinacy, and an evident and judicial Malediction from Heaven, could poſſibly continue them in that prodigious Blindneſs, out of which yet, God of his Infinite Mercy, one Day deliver them, that they may at laſt ſee and believe in *him whom they have pierced*; and that ſo both *Jew* and *Gentile* may make one *Flock* under that one *Shepherd* and *Biſhop* of our Souls, *Jeſus Chriſt* the true *Meſſiah*. Thus far, my Author.

I ſhall, next, give a ſhort Account of the Relation of *Antonius Montezinus*, which he made to *M. Ben-Iſrael* at *Amſterdam*, A. D. 1644. which made a great Noiſe in *Europe*, and raiſed in the *Jews* at that time a great expectation of their *Meſſias*, to deliver them from their preſent Captivity, and to take upon himſelf the Government of the World. This *Montezinus* was a *Portugueſe Jew*: He had travelled into the *Weſt-Indies*, and after that came to *Amſterdam*, in the Year above written; and makes the following Rela-

Relation before *M. B. Iſrael*, and ſome of the Principal *Portugueſe Jews* in that Place. I ſhall not tranſcribe the whole Relation, as it is printed by *M.B.Iſrael*, but content my ſelf with ſo much of it only as is ſufficient to my preſent purpoſe. The curious Reader may ſee the whole in a Book written by *M. B. Iſrael* upon that occaſion, which is called *Spes Iſraelis*. *Montezinus* relates as follows: *Amſtelodami*, 1650.

That two Years and an Half were elapſed ſince he left the Port of *Honda* in the *Weſt-Indies*, and went thence into the Province of *Quit*. That he hired the Mules of a certain *Indian*, who was called *Franciſcus Caſtellanus*; and that there was in his Company another who was called *Franciſcus Cazicus*. It fell out that, as they were paſſing over ſome Mountains, ſo great a Tempeſt happen'd as threw down their laden Mules. The *Indians* were much concerned at that Misfortune; but yet owned that their Sins were ſuch that they deſerved greater Calamity. *Francis* perſwaded them to take heart, and aſſured them that they ſhould meet with quiet at length. They replied that they deſerved it not; and added, that they looked upon the great Cruelty, which the *Spaniards* had exerciſed upon them, to have befallen them very juſtly from

the Hand of God, becauſe they themſelves had evil intreated God's holy and innocent People. *Montezinus* reproved *Francis* for ſpeaking ſo hardly of the *Spaniards*: He replied, that he had not related one half of their Cruelties, and that they intended to be revenged on them by the help of an unknown People. Hence *Montezinus* went to *Carthagena*, where he was impriſoned by the Inquiſition: And that in Prayer to God theſe words ſlipped from him, *Bleſſed be the Name of God, that he hath not made me an Idolater*, a *Barbarian*, a *Black*, or an *Indian*. And that upon his ſaying *Indian*, he was angry with himſelf, and ſaid that the *Indians* were *Hebrews*. And that, upon conſideration, he own'd his Miſtake, in affirming that the *Indians* were *Hebrews*; yet repeating the ſame Prayer again twice or thrice, he repeated the word *Indian* as before; which put him upon thoughtfulneſs how he ſhould ſlip ſo often in this Matter, and therefore reſolved, when he ſhould be releaſed from Priſon, as he was after a while, that he would diſcourſe with his Fellow-traveller *Francis*, and renew that Diſcourſe which he began with him on the Mountains. To that purpoſe he goes to *Honda*, finds *Francis*, engages him to travel with him, and to him he owns

owns himſelf to be an *Hebrew*, and that *Adonai* was his God, &c. And when the *Indian* asked him who were his Parents, he anſwered *Abraham*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob*; and being farther asked if he had no other Father, he anſwered that his Father's Name was *Ludovicus*. After this the *Indian* told him, if he would follow him, he would ſhew him what he deſired. He followed him to the Bank of a River, where the *Indian* told him he ſhould ſee his Brethren. Upon a Sign given, he was fetch'd over to the other Side of the River, where he met with Men that repeated to him *SHEMAH ISRAEL ADONAI ELOHENU ADONAI EHAD.* That is, the fourth Verſe of *Deut.* 6. And that then they told *Montezinus*, that *Abram*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob* were their Parents, and afterward named *Reuben*; Promiſed place to them that were diſpoſed to live among them; That *Joſeph* lived in the Midſt of the Sea; that ſhortly ſome of them ſhould go out to ſee and tread underfoot; that they ſhould ſome time talk together and pronounce *Ba*, *Ba*, *Ba*; and that their going out ſhould be as if they had come out from their Mother the Earth; that a Meſſenger ſhould go; that *Francis* ſhould ſay more: They craved leave to prepare

themſelves, and prayed, ſaying, *Ne differ*, i. e. *Delay not*; and deſired that twelve Men, ſhould be ſent to them, &c. They repeated the ſame things on the two following Days, without adding any thing. Upon this *Montezinus* took boat, but eſcaped narrowly; and they told him after that, he muſt expect no more than what he had been told before. He relates that the Boat which brought him over never ſtood ſtill, for the three Days which he ſpent among this People: But as it took four off, ſo it return'd four others, who ſpake all the very ſame things mentioned above; and that in that ſpace of time there were not leſs than 300 Comers and Goers in that Boat. He tells us that he was, when he took leave of this People, diſmiſſed very courteouſly, and preſented with Neceſſaries for his Journey. He tells us, next, what the Complexion, the Habit, &c. of theſe Men were (in which I am not concern'd to follow him) and of his taking his Journey with the *Indian*: And upon the way he examined the *Indian* what he had to relate to him farther, as his Brethren had intimated that he ſhould tell him more. Upon which, after ſome Condition interpoſed, the *Indian* told him, that thoſe Men were *Iſraelites*, brought thi-

ther

ther by the Providence of God, who wrought great Miracles for them, even beyond his Belief; that the *Indians* had treated them worſe than they were afterwards treated by the *Spaniards:* That by the Inſtigation of the *Magi* they had waged War with them three times; but their Armies were each time intirely deſtroyed, not a Man eſcaping. Upon this the *Indians* ſlew their *Magi*, ſparing ſome few, who pretended they had ſome ſecret to impart: That theſe *Magi* (who were ſpared) declared, that the God of theſe *Iſraelites* was the true God; that the Inſcriptions upon the Stones among them were true; that theſe *Iſraelites* ſhould be Lords of the Earth, towards the End of the World. They adviſed the *Indians* to make a League with them; which they accordingly did, upon certain Terms mentioned. In a word, *Montezinus* parted with great Aſſurance, that his Brethren, who commanded the *Indians*, would, when they had brought under the *Spaniards*, ſet the *Jews* at liberty, and put an End to their long Captivity.

This is the Subſtance of the Relation; and this was the occaſion of the Book called *Spes Iſraelis*, written by *M. B. Iſrael*, about 50 Years ago. That *Jew* was infinitely fond of this Relation: He now

expected the *Meſſias* to deliver them, and thought this a Fore-runner of that Deliverance. This part of the World rung of this Matter: But alas! All this came to nothing. The Relation is refuted by a Learned *Chriſtian:* And he might have ſpared his pains; for it would ſoon have fallen of it ſelf, as in truth it did.

The reaſon why I mention this, is to ſhew how little Credit is to be given to the wiſeſt and moſt Learned *Jews*, in Matters of this Nature. They that would not believe *Jeſus*, do eaſily believe a Lye, and an Impoſture; and this they are and have, from time to time, been very prone to do.

Spizelii Elevatio Relat. Montezin. Baſil. 1661.

I will add one Relation more, which the Author of *Fortalitium Fidei* relates from *Cæſarius:* And in ſhort it is this; That a certain Man of the City of *Limoges* had been too familiar with a young *Jeweſs*. She being with Child, and he fearing her Parents, uſed this Artifice to divert their Diſpleaſure. He gets an hollow Reed, goes to the Door of the Chamber where the Parents ſlept, puts one End of his Reed in the Key-hole, and through it he ſpake theſe words, calling the Parents by their proper Name; *O ye juſt Perſons and beloved of God, your Daughter, remaining a Virgin, is with Child of the*

Fortal. Fidei, l. 3. fol. 212. *Lugd.* 1525.

MES-

MESSIAS. The Old-man heard the words, and asked his Wife if ſhe did not hear them. They prayed that they might hear theſe words repeated. Upon this he repeated them again through his Reed: The Parents examined the Daughter, by whom ſhe with was Child? The Daughter replied (as ſhe was inſtructed by him who had defiled her) that whether ſhe were with Child or not ſhe could not ſay; but this ſhe could affirm, that ſhe never had the Knowledge of a Man. Upon this there was great Joy, and the *Jews* were big with Expectation. But, to their great Confuſion, the young Woman was delivered of a Daughter.

Be this as it will; this is very certain, that the *Jews* are, in theſe Matters, of eaſie Belief. And no wonder, for they have no ſteady and conſtant Principles concerning the Coming of *Meſſias*, and the End of their Captivity. Now they have rejected *Jeſus*, there is a great Variety of Opinions among them about the time when the *Meſſias* is to come. Of old it was believed that he came about the time of the Deſtruction of the *Second* Temple; afterwards, that he is not come yet. It hath been believed that the Promiſe of his *coming* was *conditional*; and at other times, that it is *fixed* and *abſolute*. There

are

are thoſe who have *computed* the time, and been miſerably *deluded:* At other times, all *computation* of times hath been forbidden under a *Curſe*. The later *Rabbins* have ſaid, the time is *near*; and others, that it is not to be but when the World is near at an *End*. Sometime the Belief of the Coming of *Meſſias* hath been reckoned a *fundamental Article* of their Faith: At other times it is eſteemed, at moſt, but a *probable opinion*. I ſhould be too large, if I ſhould count up the various opinions of their ſeveral Doctors upon this Subject. That hath been done by ſeveral Hands. God open the Eyes of the *Jews*, and turn their Hearts!

Fortal. fid. l. 3. Wagenſel. Tela ignea, P. 1. p. 614.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

The CONTENTS.

What it was which diverted me from treating of the general Converſion of the Jewiſh *Nation. What Methods are to be avoided by thoſe who attempt to convert any of them*; viz. *Compulſion or Force*; *profeſſing any thing that is againſt ſound Reaſon*; *weak Arguments, and ill Words. A ſhort Account of the preſent Condition of the* Jews. *What* Chriſtian *Princes and States may do towards the Converſion of the* Jews: *The* Jews *may be obliged to hear our Sermons, and ſubmit to Conferences: They ought not to uſe what Prayers in their Synagogues they pleaſe: They ought not to be injured, but kept low: They may be obliged to give the Government their Reaſons why they reject Chriſtianity: Of ſome other Matters that may be taken Care of by the Government. What may be done this way by others. What may be done by the Univerſities, and what by Men of Eſtates, and Men of Learning. Of the beſt way of proceeding with them in ſundry Particulars. Mean Men may do ſomething this way.*

way. That the Queſtions agitated between the Jews *and* Chriſtians *are things of the higheſt importance. That the* Jews, *of all Men in the World, are the moſt conſiderable Enemies of the* Chriſtian *Religion. The great Advantages of gaining them to the* Chriſtian *Faith. Some* Objections *againſt attempting to convert them.* Obj. 1. *That it will be loſt Labour. An Anſwer to it.* Obj. 2. *That it will bring many Poor upon us. An Anſwer to it.* Obj. 3. *That the Converts from them are generally ſcandalous and inſincere. An Anſwer to that* Objection. *The Concluſion.*

I Did fully intend, in this place, to have made an inquiry into that Belief, that the *Jewiſh* Nation ſhall be converted to the *Chriſtian* Faith, and to have ſtrictly examin'd the Grounds upon which it is built. I know very well that very Learned Men are divided in that Queſtion, and that very much may be ſaid on both ſides. It ſo happened that, as I was come to that Argument, I received a Letter from a very Learned Friend, who did aſſure me that there was a Book now in the Preſs, that treated of that Matter ſo fully, that there would be no need of my pains. I was very glad that I had ſo juſt an Excuſe to my

my Reader, having in my *Preface* to my *Second Part*, ſignified my intention of doing ſomething that way. Upon this I reſolved to conſider, in this Chapter, what we are to do toward the Converſion of the *Jews*; that being a Matter wherein we are more nearly and highly concerned. For thoſe who are of each ſide of the other Queſtion, agree in this, that we are all bound, in our ſeveral Capacities, to contribute what we can to ſo Bleſſed a Work. And thoſe Men who do not believe that the *Jewiſh* Nation ſhall ever be generally converted, yet make no doubt but ſome of them may; and that it is our unqueſtionable Duty to promote their Converſion what we can: And before I proceed to my main Deſign, *viz.* to ſhew what we are obliged to do to that End, I ſhall ſhew what we are to forbear, or what we ought not to do.

And it is certain that we muſt forbear Force and Violence. We ought not to compell them into the *Chriſtian* Church by Force of Arms. This carries no Conviction with it. It may make Hypocrites; it will never make true Converts. *Chriſtianity*, where it is pure, does not inſpire its Diſciples with this Spirit of Perſecution; 'tis the worſt Cauſe that is moſt fierce and fell. *He that is born after the Fleſh*,

Fleſh, perſecutes him that is born after the Spirit. The *Jews* will never be gained this way. This will rather alienate them from the *Chriſtian* Faith, and make them ſuſpect that we want *Arguments*, to evict the Truth of our Religion, when inſtead of them, we endeavour to bring them over by *Blows*. Dragooning will never convince Mankind: All the Conviction it can carry is of a bad *Cauſe*, and an *impotent* Paſſion in them that uſe it. The Primitive Church did not proceed in this Method.

Nor are we ever like to convert the *Jews*, while we teach any Doctrines againſt common Sence, and againſt the expreſs Letter of the Law of *Moſes*. The *Jews* are not ſuch Fools as to be gained over in this Caſe. The *Worſhipping of Images*, and the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, are great Stumbling-blocks to the *Jews*. The Church which teacheth theſe Doctrines is very unfit to bring over the *Jews*. Had *Jeſus* delivered theſe Doctrines, I ſhould have abſolutely deſpaired of the *Jews* Converſion: For, if things be duly weighed, this would have been a perpetual and inſuperable Barr: But as we do not find theſe things taught by *Jeſus*, ſo are they no where to be found in any of the Sermons or Writings of the *Apoſtles*.

Theſe

Theſe things are indeed taught in the Church of *Rome*, but are inconſiſtent with the Scriptures, and repugnant to the Reaſon of Mankind. I know it hath been pretended that *Tranſubſtantiation* is not more repugnant to Reaſon than the Doctrine of the *Trinity* is. This Matter hath been, in ſome Meaſure, conſidered before. I have ſaid enough to prove that *Tranſubſtantiation* is utterly repugnant to ſound Reaſon.

But on the other Hand, the Scripture Doctrine of the *Trinity* is no ways repugnant to it. They that think otherwiſe, have not yet been able to defend that Belief. That there are three Perſons, and one Nature, is what we believe: That is, that there are Three in One. We do not affirm that three Perſons are but one Perſon, or that one Nature are three Natures. It is no ways againſt Reaſon to affirm that one individual Nature is communicable to three Perſons: And while we believe one Nature, we are ſure there cannot be three Gods. Nor can we with Reaſon affirm that the *Divine* Nature cannot communicate it ſelf after any other manner than a *Created* Nature can. There are many things we have reaſon to believe, which yet we have not Ability to comprehend. We believe that God is Eternal: But to conceive

ceive a Being ſhould be from it ſelf, is as hard to comprehend, not to ſay much harder, than to comprehend how an individual Nature ſhould be communicated to three diſtinct Perſons. For the *Firſt* of theſe, we have nothing to reſemble it by: For the *other*, we have ſomething like it: Allowing the Soul to have three Faculties, *Underſtanding*, *Will*, and *Memory*, we may ſay here are *Three in One*, and theſe Three not confounded one with another, and yet is there but *one* Soul. Again, we believe God's *Omnipreſence*: And yet it is hard to conceive that Attribute without *Extenſion* and *Diviſibility*; which yet are by no means to be attributed to God. They who object againſt the *Trinity*, ſhould conſider what Account they can give of *theſe* things, which yet they have *Reaſon* to *believe* (and do believe) but not *Abilities* to *comprehend*. But this may be thought too great a Digreſſion: I therefore return.

See Dialogue between a *Proteſtant* and *Papiſt*, 1687.

I add that the *Jews* are never like to be converted with *weak Arguments*, and *hard Words*. We muſt uſe them with great Humanity, and diſpute with them with *Arguments* that are proper and cogent, that carry with them great Conviction and Evidence. It is very certain that too many *Chriſtians*, who have written againſt them,

them, have been very defective this way. Many have uſed Arguments that have no force, and have advanced many Propoſitions that are void of Truth. It would be too invidious a thing for me to produce any Inſtances to this purpoſe; nor is it any way needfull that I ſhould do it. This is certain, that this Method will be ſo far from convincing them, that it rather ſerves to harden them. The *Jews* will be apt enough to conclude, that we have little to ſay, when we urge them with Arguments that are trifling, or untrue. We do but loſe ground, when we do this; and inſtead of gaining *them*, we expoſe *our ſelves*, and *our Cauſe* alſo. The *Jews* do mightily triumph upon all ſuch occaſions. Thanks be to God we do not want the moſt clear and ſolid Arguments to prove our *Chriſtian* Religion againſt the *Jews*. We can prove the Truth of our Religion againſt all its Enemies: But eſpecially againſt the *Jews*; becauſe we agree with them in many Principles, on which we may proceed againſt them. We need not to uſe Sophiſtry, or weak and inſufficient *Mediums*. But then I muſt add, that we muſt not give them *ill Words* neither. We muſt avoid all reproachfull Language, all that is ſarcaſtical and biting. This never did good

from Pulpit or from Preſs. The ſofteſt words will make the deepeſt impreſſion. And if we think it a fault in them to give ill Language, we cannot be excuſed when we imitate them.

Nor ought we to quit any Article of the *Chriſtian* Faith, that we may gain the *Jews*. Tis a fond Conceit of a late *Socinian* Writer, that we ſhall upon *their* Principles be moſt like to prevail upon the *Jews*: It is not true in Matter of Fact. Let them ſhew, if they can, what Proſelytes they have made: Or if any, what Proportion they bear to thoſe who have been gained by others. We muſt not give up any Article to gain them. I ſay, not any *Article*: But then the Church of *Rome* ought to part with many *Practices*, and ſome *Doctrines* too; but they are ſuch as were never in any Ancient *Creed*. We are not to deſign to gain the *Jews* over to a Party, or a Syſtem of *Dogmata*, but to the Ancient and Primitive Faith.

Before I proceed to ſhew what we are to do toward the Converſion of the *Jews*, it is fit I ſhould premiſe ſome Account of the Preſent State of the *Jews*. And indeed their Condition is very pitiable, and requires the greateſt Commiſeration.

A very

A very great Number of them are in the Countries of the *Mahometans*. There have been formerly great Numbers of them in *Perſia*. There are ſtill vaſt Numbers at *Conſtantinople* and *Salonichi*, and in other Parts of the *Turkiſh* Dominions. In theſe Places there is nothing to be expected, as to their Converſion to the *Chriſtian* Faith. Too many of them have, inſtead of turning *Chriſtians*, turned *Turks*; and are under too great Temptations ſo to do: For when it happens they fall into any great Straits, and become obnoxious to the Government, this is the only way to gain Relief and Protection. The Immunities and Security they gain by this Means is a great Temptation upon them.

There are a great Number of them who live in *Chriſtian* Countries, and many of them live undiſturbed. But then as to the Hopes of their Converſion, they are not in Circumſtances all alike.

Great Numbers are in the *Popiſh* Countries, in *Poland*, and in *Italy*, and particularly at *Rome*. But ſuch are the Stumbling-blocks which that Church lays in their way, that there is little hope of their Converſion there. Beſides, that in *Rome* it ſelf there is very little Care taken of this Matter. This is the more ſtrange,

becauſe the Biſhop of *Rome* pretends to be the Succeſſour of St. *Peter*; and we know, he was the *Apoſtle of the Circumciſion*: To which I may add, that whereas they have in *Rome* a Famous College *pro propagandâ fide*, and they have made great Attempts to convert other Nations, and have a vaſt Number of Types for printing Books in their ſeveral Languages to that purpoſe, yet are the poor *Jews* neglected: And whatever St. *Peter* was, yet his Succeſſours do not manage Matters as if they had any Concern for *the Circumciſion*: So that the unhappy *Jew* may truly ſay, *No Man careth for my Soul.* This is a very ſad Story; I wiſh ſtill it were all the fault which the Church of *Rome* could be charged with in this Matter. That Church is ſo far from uſing all due means for the converting that People, that their Doctrines and Practices are ſuch, that they hinder them from the embracing the *Chriſtian* Faith. Whatever pains they take to gain other Proſelytes, the Care of the *Jews* is laid aſide. A late Learned Writer, who well underſtood theſe Matters, offers at the Reaſon of this Conduct of the Church of *Rome*, in ſhewing a great Concern for the Converſion of other Nations, and at the ſame time a Neglect of the *Jews*. If they could convert any *Pa-*

gan

gan or Infidel Nation, they might thence have a conſiderable Acceſſion to their Church, both of Glory and Revenue alſo. But alaſs the *Jews* are a ſcattered and peeled People: Their Converſion would add no new Territory, or Countrv, nor any Revenue or Preferments. Nay rather, on the other hand, it would be a Loſs to the Churches Treaſure. It cannot be ſuppoſed but the *Jews* pay ſome Tribute into the Churches Treaſury for the Privilege of living ſecurely in the Pope's Territories, which, if they ſhould turn *Chriſtians*, could not be exacted. If all the *Jews* in *Rome* were converted, the Churches Patrimony would not be enlarged by it, the Tribute would be leſs, and the Poor (who muſt be maintained) would be more. If this be the Reaſon of this Conduct, I am ſure it is not derived from the *Chriſtian* Religion.

But yet, after all, I muſt own, that there is ſomething done at *Rome*, that hath ſome Appearance of Care for the Converſion of the *Jews*. The *Jews* are obliged to hear Sermons at a certain Place appointed; and ſo they do. There is an Officer with a Wand in his Hand, who overlooks them, and does not fail to ſtrike them alſo when they do not behave themſelves decently. There is alſo a *Dominican* appointed to

preach before them, and he does preach. This is the Care that St. *Peter*'s Succeſſor takes over this *his peculiar* Flock. All this amounts to very little; and it cannot be thought it ſhould have any great Effect, all things duly conſidered. What the *Dominican* is, I know not: I'm ſure of this, that he had need be of great Learning and Skill: And after all, there is little hope of doing much good, till that Church ſhall remove the Stumbling-blocks ſhe has laid in the way of the *Jews*.

From what hath been ſaid we ſee the ſad Condition in which the far greater Part of the *Jews* are.

Some of them, indeed, are in *Proteſtant* Countries, where the *Chriſtian* Doctrine is truly repreſented. Some Numbers of them are in the *Low Countries*, where they are uſed with great Humanity: Others there are in *Hamburgh* and other Cities. We have a ſmall Number in *London*. After all, I fear we have not taken that Care of their Souls as well becomes us to do. Much might be done to this End by Princes and States; ſomething by Perſons of Eſtates and of Learning; and, indeed, ſomewhat this way by Men of low Condition.

I will

I will firſt ſhew what *Kings* and *States* may do towards ſo bleſſed a Work. I am well aware that this is a tender Argument, and to be handled with great Caution, and all due Submiſſion: And I hope I ſhall offer nothing that can give offence. I am ſure of this, that I ſhall not offend any of thoſe who are the genuine Followers of *Jeſus*, who was content to take our Nature upon him, and to die upon a Croſs, that he might ſeek and ſave that which was loſt.

Firſt, Though I am not for compelling the *Jews* to turn *Chriſtians*, yet *Chriſtian* Kings and States may oblige them to hear our Sermons, and admit of our Conferences. This is what they have ſubmitted to at *Rome*, and elſewhere. Their Law does not forbid them thus much. They read our *New Teſtament*, and other Books; and can, out of Curioſity, hear our Sermons alſo. And 'twill be no hardſhip at all to oblige them to thus much, at leaſt. I remember that *Aben Amram* complains greatly, that they have not the liberty of the Preſs, and that for want of it they are hindred from producing their force, as they would otherwiſe do. Far be it from me for pleading for any ſuch liberty as that: But if ſome Men were I.

appointed to preach to them, and at certain times to confer with their Teachers, and more Learned Men, they would have no Cauſe to complain for want of the Preſs. They might have liberty to draw out all their force upon ſuch occaſions; and that alſo before their own People. This Courſe would be ſufficient for them, and much better than to grant them the Liberty of Printing. If they have a mind to draw up their Forces, let them do it when their Enemies are within ſight. In a Conference *they* will be preſent that are ready to anſwer, and beſt able; their Prints may fall into other hands: And *Chriſtian* Kings will think themſelves obliged to preſerve their Subjects in the true Faith. If the *Jews* were called, at certain *fixed* times, before the Prince, or ſome deputed by him, to give in the Reaſons why they reject the *Chriſtian* Religion, thoſe Reaſons, in a fair Conference, might be diſcuſſed, and ſatisfaction be given to them, and then the *Jews* might have a fair occaſion to ſhew their full ſtrength. Such a ſetled Courſe as this might be of great uſe; and by the Bleſſing of God, might bring them into the Church, upon Conviction. I ſay, upon Conviction: For it is much to be feared that ſome that have formerly come into the Church, have

have not come in upon Conviction, but for Bread, or for Preferment, out of ſome great Fear, or in hopes of ſome worldly Boon: And this hath manifeſtly appeared afterward in ſome of them. Certain it is, that it is a very great Favour in *Chriſtian* Kings and States, to permit the *Jews* to live in their ſeveral Kingdoms and Countries, without Diſturbance. They do very well know that the *Jews* are profeſſed Enemies to the *Chriſtian* Faith, that they are alſo the moſt bitter Enemies that the *Chriſtians* have in the World, and that they repute *Jeſus*, whom we worſhip, as a Deceiver and Impoſtor. They muſt never expect ſuch Humanity as they ſhew: And therefore it is highly reaſonable that they who permit them to live ſecurely ſhould put ſuch Terms upon them as their Law does not forbid, and uſe all imaginable ways to bring them over to the true Faith. This is the greateſt Charity that can be ſhewed them, and the greateſt Imitation of the Love of God in *Chriſt Jeſus*. God of his Mercy inſpire all *Chriſtian* Princes and States with this *Chriſtian* Spirit.

II. Though I am not againſt the Liberty allowed to the *Jews*, of reading their Law and uſing their Prayers and Hymns in their

their Synagogues, yet I humbly offer that all *Chriſtian* Princes and States ſhould not permit this Liberty without ſome Reſtraint and Conditions. It is not reaſonable that they ſhould have the liberty to uſe what Prayers they pleaſe, or to blaſpheme the Holy Name of *Jeſus*; or to do any thing reproachfull to our Holy Religion. 'Tis fit the Government ſhould be ſecured as to theſe things. To curſe the *Chriſtians* (under the Name of *Edomites*, or *Minim*, i. e. Hereticks) is not to be allowed; nor is it fit they ſhould revile *Jeſus*, either in their publick Offices, or in their Converſation, and blaſpheme the Holy Trinity. I will not take upon me to preſcribe to my Superiours in this Caſe: They may uſe their own Wiſdom, in appointing an Inſpector, or requiring ſuch ſecurity as they in their Wiſdoms ſhall think fit. But this I will dare to ſay, that it cannot conſiſt with the Honour of *Chriſtian* Princes and States, to allow the *Jews* an abſolute and unreſtrained Liberty, to uſe what Prayers and ſtated Offices they think fit. For though they do not believe our Doctrine, nor yet our *Jeſus* to be the *Chriſt*, yet it is highly reaſonable that they ſhould not be permitted to revile and reproach them. For their Belief, we cannot hinder them of that; nor

is

is it always in our Power to bring them over to believe as we do: But they ought not to be permitted to blaſpheme, and ſpeak Evil of our Saviour. For this is an high Immorality, which is to be chaſtiſed: And as this Practice of the *Jews* is againſt good *Manners*, ſo it is (as I have elſewhere obſerved out of *Joſephus*) alſo againſt the Letter of their own Law. And that grave Author tells us elſewhere, *That it becomes thoſe who are wiſe to continue ſtedfaſt in their own Laws, which concern their Religion, but not to revile the Laws of others.* This is a Profaneneſs which is to be puniſhed ſeverely, and would not have gone unpuniſhed among the *Heathens* themſelves. I very well know, that the *Jews* will not own that they are guilty in this kind. But we can prove it upon them very eaſily. And though I have that Charity to believe, that the *Jews* are not guilty of all thoſe ill Practices with which they ſtand charged, yet they have been very guilty in this Matter.

Joſephus Contr. Apion. l. 2.

III. Though the *Jews* ought not to be injured and oppreſſed, yet I verily believe nothing can be more adviſable than to keep them low. They cannot bear great Proſperity: Nothing can be more diſagreeable to their preſent Captivity. *Chriſtian*

ſtian Princes and States cannot be blamed for protecting them from rude Aſſaults and from Oppreſſion: But cannot think themſelves obliged to advance them to Dignities, to careſs and court them, to grant them uncommon Favours, or veſt them with great Privileges, or any kind of Power and Juriſdiction. This Courſe will rather obſtruct, than any way promote their Converſion; which yet is that which all *Chriſtian* Kings and States ſhould aim at. They cannot reaſonably expect ſuch Favours, who Crucified the Holy *Jeſus*, and profeſs to believe that he was an Impoſtor. Theſe Favours and Preferments will render them inſolent and untractable; and they will ſoon conclude themſelves the Favourites of Heaven, when they meet with great Proſperities on Earth. They have always judged thus: Beſides, they will think themſelves in a ſafer Condition than they are, when they find themſelves careſſed by *Chriſtian* States. I have heard of a Rich *Jew* at *Amſterdam*, who treated a *Chriſtian* very ſplendidly. When the *Chriſtian* mentioned to him the preſent Captivity of the Nation, the *Jew* ſmiled at it; and ſaid, *What is this Captivity?* and proteſted, that he ſhould not be willing to return to the Land of *Canaan*, where he could not expect the Conveniences

veniences which he enjoyed where he was. The truth is, they are wedded to this World: And though they do *magnifie* their Law in their Books and Sermons, yet it is Wealth and worldly Splendour which they drive at. And when a *Jew* was told of the Prophets, he replied frankly, that he cared not for the ſayings of the *Prophet*; it was only his *Profit* that he regarded.

It is very well known that their Books are full of Relations of the Dignity and Glories of their Nation: That they had even in the *Babyloniſh* Captivity their *Princes*, which were the Governours among them. They brag to this Day of the Favour they have in the Courts of Princes: And *Benjamin*, in his *Itinerary*, relates wonderfull Stories of the Greatneſs of this People in ſome Parts of the World. (no Man can find where) even during this Captivity: And *Montezinus* related a blind Story of the Ten Tribes to *M. Ben-Iſrael*, which that Learned *Jew* believed, and made great ſtir about it. So vain are this People, and prone to believe a Lye. But if any *Chriſtian* Prince or State ſhould grant them any Power or Juriſdiction, even over their own People, in Matters of ſmall Concernment, they would exult upon this Occaſion, and make a very

a very ill uſe of it. A Learned Friend of mine aſſures me, that he hath had the Experience of this: He relates that when he was at *Worms*, A. D. 1682. the *Jews* of that City did, before the Magiſtrates and Clergy met together, make their Exception againſt the *Chriſtians* urging of *Gen.* 49. *v.* 10. *The Scepter ſhall not depart from* Judah, *&c.* They affirmed that they had the Scepter among them ſtill; and they grounded it upon this, *viz.* Becauſe they were permitted, by the Magiſtrates of that place, to puniſh ſome of their own People in leſſer Crimes, or Injuries, to the Value of Fifteen-pence of our Money. Of ſo dangerous a Conſequence it is to grant them any Degree or Shadow of Authority and Juriſdiction, who make ſo ill an uſe of it. The liberty which the *Jews* are permitted among us, is as much as they can reaſonably expect, and as much as they can bear, and a great deal more than they do deſerve. They are the greateſt Enemies of our Religion; and I have reaſon to believe that the *Deiſts*, and Enemies of all revealed Religion, have received the main of their Artillery from the *Jews* themſelves, with which they have attacqu'd it. The *Jews* endeavour with all their might to run down the *Chriſtian* Belief; and conſequently the

Chri-

Chriſtian Life and Devotion: Nor do they, in the room thereof, give us any Pattern of any kind of Devotion at all. If any Man would take the pains to go to their Synagogue, and obſerve their Behaviour, he will ſtrongly be tempted to believe, that they are ſo far from being of the true Religion, that they are of none at all. They do indeed read the Law and the Prophets, make uſe of ſeveral Hymns and Ancient Forms of Prayer: But all this while they ſhall diſcourſe with any ſtranger who comes to them, about any trivial and trifling Matters, as if they were altogether unconcerned in the publick Worſhip of God. This is their conſtant Practice in their Synagogues, on their Sabbath-days. Such Men as theſe are not to be careſſed and favoured, who revile *our* Religious Worſhip, and at the ſame time caſt Contempt upon their *own*.

IV. *Chriſtian* Princes and States may oblige the *Jews* to appear before them, or their Commiſſioners, at certain fixed Times (as they ſhall think fit to appoint) and by their *Chachams* and Wiſe-men to exhibit their Reaſons in writing, and ſigned, why they continue in *Judaiſm*, and reject *Chriſtianity*. Theſe Papers they may

may order to be delivered to ſuch Learned Men as are fit to draw up an Anſwer to them, which may be returned to the *Jews*; to which they ſhould be obliged to give an Anſwer in writing, as before, at a limited Time. After this a publick Conference may be appointed, and the *Jews* permitted to defend themſelves, without Moleſtation, and to anſwer the *Chriſtians*, who ſhall be deputed to diſpute with them. The *Jews* will, then, have no Cauſe to complain of the want of the Preſs; nor have any ground to ſay that they have many things to ſay for themſelves, had they but liberty to produce them. This Courſe would intirely remove that Pretext: Nor could they, under this Method, complain that they were ſurprized; for they would have time enough to conſult and premeditate and put all their force in order. Nothing can be offered that is more fair and reaſonable than ſuch a Method as this. But then theſe Papers, between the *Chriſtians* and the *Jews*, ought to be preſerved in ſome ſafe Repoſitory; as alſo all the Minutes of the Conference, well atteſted; that it may appear to future Ages what Care has been taken by the Government to bring them over to the true Faith; which will be much to the Honour of it, whatever other

other Succeſs this Method have. And verily, it is much to be hoped, that this Courſe, if ſteadily purſued, will not want good Succeſs.

And in that Caſe the Government may appoint Learned and fit Men, farther to inſtruct theſe Converts, in the Doctrine of the New Teſtament. And after they are Baptized, to prepare them for a ſolemn Confirmation, and the receiving the Holy Communion. And by this time, the Governours of the Church will think it reaſonable to conſider of ſome Form of Confeſſion, to be conſtantly uſed before their Admiſſion into the Church by Baptiſm; and what Methods are fit to be uſed afterwards, for the confirming them in their Holy Faith. V.

To this purpoſe it will be needfull that the *Oriental* Learning, eſpecially of the *Hebrew* Tongue, ſhould be encouraged and revived; that Men may be this way fitted and prepared to encounter the *Jews*. The time hath been, even in this laſt Age, that our Kingdom hath been furniſhed with Men as eminent this way, as any that ever appeared in the World; Men that underſtood the *Jewiſh* Learning incomparably better than the moſt VI.

Learned of the *Jews* themſelves. But theſe Men are dead, and thoſe Studies have been too much neglected, and by too many deſpiſed alſo. 'Twill be a very eaſie thing for *Chriſtian* Princes and States to take care to encourage theſe Studies: I muſt not preſume to tell them by what Methods: That muſt be left to their great Wiſdom. I am ſure it is high time that ſomething ſhould be done this way. Eſpecially ſince the *Jews* endeavour now to deprive us of all the needfull Inſtruments which we ſhould uſe in our Diſputes with them. For (as I have elſewhere obſerved) ſince we have intermitted theſe Studies, they have bought up the *Rabbinical* Books of the Learned *Chriſtians* deceaſed. And *we* are dealt by, as the *Iſraelites* once were by the *Philiſtines*, who deprived them of the Inſtruments of War, ſo that in the Day of Battel *there was neither Sword nor Spear found in the hand of any of the People*, 1 Sam. 13.22.

VII. The Government will think it needfull, to protect the Converts from the Inſults and Oppreſſions of the Synagogue. And that muſt be done by ſome ſevere Penalty. It is hard to conceive how much they deteſt an *Apoſtate*, as they are pleaſed to call the Convert to *Chriſtianity*. They

They curſe him bitterly, and perſecute him where 'tis in their Power. Their People are under great dread, and ſlaviſh Fear, on this Conſideration. And this is a great Bar to many, that might otherwiſe be wrought upon. It is but reaſonable to ſecure thoſe that come over to us.

What I have ſaid under this laſt Head, concerning Conferences with the *Jews*, is no Novel Project, or Conceit of my own. It was practiſed in the earlieſt Times of *Chriſtianity*. Thus we read of *Apollos*, an *Alexandrian Jew, that he mightily convinced*——Acts 18. 28. And of St. *Paul*, that the *Jews* had *appointed him a Day*——Acts 28. 23. And it appears from *v.* 24. that this Conference was not without Succeſs. I mention it under this Head, becauſe it is very fit, now *Chriſtianity* is the Religion of the Nation, that the *Chriſtian* Prince or State ſhould appoint the Time and Place for ſuch publick Meetings: And alſo becauſe the Countenance of the Government will give theſe Meetings the greater Authority and Power, render them more regular, and more likely to prevail and gain their End. And I make no doubt but that *Chriſtian* Kings and States will readily give Countenance and Aſſiſtance to ſo bleſſed a Work, if they be applied to,

with that Regard which is fit, by their Miniſters; and eſpecially by Eccleſiaſticks. But this may ſuffice at preſent as to this Head, what *Chriſtian Kings* and *States* may do in ſo good a Work.

I come *next* to conſider what *others* may do in this Matter. For certain it is much may be done this way by our united Studies and Endeavours. I will preſume that the Governours and Inſtructors of the Church will not be wanting in promoting ſo good a Work. And next to them

The *Univerſities* may do very much. What they do, and may do, will be of a mighty Influence in this Matter. They are furniſhed with all the Inſtruments and Weapons to be uſed in this Holy War. They may eaſily raiſe a very ſufficient Number of Men, well fitted on all Occaſions, to engage in it. The *Heads of Houſes* can eaſily engage Men in theſe Studies, and encourage and reward them. Thoſe who are in thoſe Places have vaſt Advantages: They have all manner of Books relating to theſe Studies (which are no where elſe to be had) and have the Advantage of Converſation and mutual Aſſiſtances. They may, with their united Strength, eaſily ſearch into all the *Jewiſh* Antiquity, examine nicely into all the

the main Queſtions agitated between *Chriſtians* and *Jews*, digeſt the whole Controverſie under its proper Heads, and bring into their Service whatever hath been ſaid by *Jews*, or other Writers, which will make to their purpoſe. They may ſometimes in their Publick *Schools*, and frequently in their ſeveral *Houſes*, diſpute theſe Queſtions, and by that Practice become very expert in the Controverſie: They have leiſure and time, and all the helps imaginable. Others, that live remote from Books, and have a Multitude of Buſineſs, can do but little; when nothing can be too hard or knotty for thoſe in ſuch fair Circumſtances. And nothing can be more agreeable to the End of theſe *Foundations*, and the pious Intentions of their *Founders* and *Benefactors*, than to endeavour to bring Men to the true *Faith*, and defend our *Revealed Religion* againſt its Oppoſers.

Men of *Eſtates* alſo may do very much this way: And 'twill be hard to find any other way of beſtowing them that can vye with this. For this is to lay them out for the propagating that Faith, and defending that Holy Religion, by which we hope to be ſaved. And if that be conſidered duly, we ſhall need no other Motive to excite us. What is beſtowed

this way, can never miſs of a Reward. And were it not for this Advantage of Wealth, that it enables us to encourage Virtue and advance Religion, it were a very contemptible thing. There are ſome young Men (even at this time) who would be able to make vaſt Progreſs in thoſe Studies which tend immediately to this End, were it not for want of ſome Aſſiſtance this way: And many very Great Men have been loſt for want of ſuch help. Very many that have a *great Genius* have but a *narrow Purſe*: And no Man can arrive at any Perfection in theſe Studies, without conſiderable Supplies. Many things might be offered under this Head; as, great Benefactions to thoſe who are able and diſpoſed; *e. g.* The founding a Lecture in the City, on condition the *Jews* were obliged to be preſent, wherein all the Controverſies between them and us ſhou'd be handled, by ſeveral Perſons yearly choſen: The founding ſome *Hebrew Scholarſhips* in the *Univerſity*, to be enjoyed by none before they had taken their *firſt Degree*, and could give ſome *Specimen* of their Skill, and who ſhould enjoy it no longer than they gave good Proofs of their Proficiency: The aſſigning ſome Reward to him that ſhould tranſlate ſome part of the

Miſna,

Miſna, which hath not been done before: Or to him that ſhould turn the Whole, with ſhort Notes; which hath been attempted by ſeveral Learned Men, but hath been performed by no Man.

I come next to ſhew what *Learned* Men may do toward the Converſion of the *Jews*. I am very far from excluding any ſort of Learning: All that deſerves that Name is of great uſe: But the *Jewiſh* Learning in this Matter is eſpecially ſo. He that hath good skill in the *Biblical Hebrew*, the *Chaldee Paraphraſts*, and the other *Jewiſh* Learning, will certainly be much fitter to confer with the *Jews*, than he that wants it. The *Jews* are a very ſubtle People; and (which is worſe) not fair in their Diſputes with *Chriſtians*, as I have abundantly proved before. They will advance Propoſitions void of all truth; and lay hold of an Accent, or little *Grammatical Criticiſm*, to amuſe the *Chriſtians*, and to ſerve their Cauſe. And though there be no Weight in what they ſay, and ('tis to be feared) they know it, yet they will endeavour to blunder their Adverſary, and put him to a ſtand, and triumph and inſult over him. This makes it much more difficult to deal with them; and next to impoſſible, without ſome competent skill in their *Learning*. Beſides, he

that is skilled in *their* Books hath this Advantage againſt them, that he can thence be furniſhed with a great many *Argumenta ad hominem*; which is of great Moment in this Caſe. The more things the *Jews* grant, the greater Advantage we have againſt them. They pay a mighty Reverence to the *Targums*, and ſome other Old Books; and though they make no Scruple to depart from them, to ſerve a turn, yet they do not care to have them urged againſt them. Their great Deſign is to run down *Chriſtianity*; and care not if they depart from the Belief of their Foreſathers, to gain that End, though otherwiſe no People in the World are more tenacious of the Traditions of their Anceſtors. Upon theſe Accounts it is very needfull, that thoſe who are employed in publick Conferences with them ſhould not be altogether ſtrangers to *their* Learning: The Learned *Profeſſors* of the *Hebrew* Tongue, and others skilfull in thoſe Matters, will be fit Perſons to be choſen on this occaſion.

I ſhall now proceed to conſider the beſt way of proceeding with the *Jews*, in order to bring them over to the *Chriſtian* Faith: In this I am far from preſcribing, and ſhall be moſt ready to ſubmit to better Judgements. In the mean time,

I. I can-

I. I cannot but admit of the Advice of a certain Learned Perſon, who hath been an Inſtrument of converting more *Jews* (among which are a conſiderable Number of *Rabbins*) than perhaps have ever been converted by any one Perſon in the World, ſince the Age of Miracles: It is the Reverend *Eſdras Edzard S. Th. L.* of *Hamburgh*. He tells me (in a Letter dated *Sept.* 13. 1698.) that he generally begins with the *Jews* from *Deut.* 27. 26. *Curſed be he that confirmeth not* all *the words of this Law to do them, and all the People ſhall ſay*, Amen. And *Chap.* 28. v. 58. *If thou wilt not obſerve to do all the words of this Law*, that are *written in this Book, that thou mayeſt fear this glorious and fearfull Name*, THE LORD THY GOD; it follows *v.* 59. *Then the Lord will make thy Plagues wonderfull, and the Plagues of thy Seed*; even *great Plagues, and of long continuance*; *and ſore ſickneſſes, and of long continuance.* And though I will not ſay that the very ſame Method is to be uſed in all Caſes, yet I cannot but think that generally ſpeaking it is very fit to begin here. For here we begin with an avowed Principle: We make uſe of the *Law* to the beſt purpoſe, as *a School-maſter to bring Men to Chriſt*; and uſe the ſame To-

Topick which St. *Paul* uſed, *Gal.* 3. 10. *As many as are of the Works of the Law are under the Curſe: for it it written, curſed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the Book of the Law, to do them.* On which Place I have, in the foregoing part of this Treatiſe, had occaſion to enlarge, againſt the Pretenſions of *Amram*. I always thought it to bear very hard upon the *Jews*, and think ſo ſtill. They are certainly under the Curſe of their own Law; and that is expreſſed by as plain words as may be. They could never pretend to have continued in *all* the Words or Precepts of the Law, *to do* them.

P. 134.

They could not ſay this of themſelves during their Abode in their own Land, and the ſtanding of their Temple. Then indeed they had ſome Relief in this Matter, becauſe God allowed of an Atonement by Sacrifices, in ſome Caſes of Failure; they might then hope that, though they had failed in Obedience, they might upon their Sacrifices be admitted to God's Favour. But they have not that hope now, they being *without a Sacrifice*: (Hoſ. *ch.* 3. v. 4.) And though even under the Law they were in ſome Caſes not permitted a Sacrifice, but for the hainouſneſs of their Sin were liable to Exciſion

ſion (*Lev.* 20.) yet now is their Condition much worſe, they not being in any Caſe permitted to ſacrifice; and conſequently, lie under the Curſe of their own Law: And the Providence of God, that hath excluded them from their own Land, and from their Temple, ſeems to direct them plainly enough to our *Meſſias*, and the meritorious Sacrifice of his Death, who died for Mankind. This Topick may be ſo urged againſt the *Jews*, that with God's Aſſiſtance it may have good Effect upon them. It may be ſo purſued and preſſed, that the *Jew* will not find it any eaſie thing to bear up againſt the weight of it.

II. Since the *Jews* cannot but own a Guilt, we may here preſs them with the Neceſſity of ſome Atonement or Expiation, to quiet the Mind, and ſet the Conſcience at eaſe. There is great need of this where-ever there is Guilt; and this hath been the general Senſe of Mankind. Hence it was that the *Gentiles* uſed Sacrifices and other Rites to appeaſe an offended Deity: A great Number of the Sacrifices appointed the *Jews*, were upon this Account, as appears plainly from the Law of *Moſes*.

III. That

III. That there is no Atonement to be expected but what the *Meſſias* was to make, as is predicted and ſet forth in Holy Writ. Here we may urge them with *Pſ.* 22. with *Dan.* 9. and eſpecially with *Iſa.* 53. It will be no hard thing to prove that *Iſaiah* does not in that place deſcribe the Sufferings of the Prophet, or of the People of *Iſrael.*

IV. That *Jeſus* is that *Meſſias*, and conſequently his Religion is true. And this may be proved, by all thoſe ways by which they are able to prove the Divine Miſſion of *Moſes*; by an infinite Number of Teſtimonies out of the Old Teſtament; by many Facts that are inconteſtable; by the miraculous Succeſs of his Religion againſt all the Wit and Force that could be uſed againſt it; by a Conjugation of Arguments that bear down before them all Cauſe of doubting in this Matter. I conſider that it is not fit I ſhould be very particular, becauſe they who are ſuppoſed to be concerned, are Men of Learning, and do not therefore need any operoſe Direction: And the more they confirm what they urge againſt the *Jews* with Authorities from their own Writings, the more likely they will be to prevail.

In

In this bleſſed Work, *Meaner* Men may be able to do ſomething. They are not able to *diſpute*, but they can *live*. They can adorn their Religion; they can put up earneſt Prayers to God for the *Jews*; they can ſhew them great Humanity, deal and traffick with them with great Integrity and Simplicity. And certainly, if all private *Chriſtians* would do this, they would be able to do much in ſo bleſſed a Work: And 'twill be worth our while to do our utmoſt (according to our ſeveral Abilities) toward ſo good an End. For

Firſt, The Queſtions debated between us and the *Jews*, are things of the higheſt Importance and Concern whatever. It is at once the whole *Chriſtian* Religion that the *Jews* call in queſtion and would overturn. We *Chriſtians* diſpute one againſt another with great Heat and Animoſity: We do it about Trifles, concerning Rites and Modes of Worſhip; about Decrees, and the Divine Preſcience, about things we do not underſtand, and in which we may be ſafely on the wrong ſide; here we are fierce and poſitive, fond of our ſeveral Opinions, and uncharitable to one another: In the mean time, in the main Controverſie between us and the *Jews*, we are cold and indifferent: As if the

the Skirts and Fringes of Religion were of greater Care to us than the Vitals and Power of it. We ſeem to be willing enough that the *Jews* ſhould be indulged, even without any Terms and Conditions, when we think much of any kind of forbearance of one another: And if it be reaſonable (and 'tis thought ſo by the *Government*) that a Liberty ſhould not be granted to thoſe who diſſent from our eſtabliſhed Forms and Conſtitutions but upon certain Terms and Conditions; ſurely it is highly reaſonable that the *Jews*, who are Enemies to our whole Religion, ſhould be under ſome Reſtraints and Conditions; and more eſpecially under ſuch as tend to bring them into the Church, and may ſecure us that they ſhall not blaſpheme our Lord and Saviour. If the *Jews* be in the right, we are, indeed, in a very miſerable Condition; our Faith and Hope are in vain, we are ſtill in our Sins, without God, and without Hope in the World. In our differences with each other, many times ſuch is the Queſtion, that we may be miſtaken, and be ſafe; be on the *wrong* ſide of the Queſtion, and yet in the *right* way to Heaven. If we be wrong in this Diſpute with the *Jews*, we err fundamentally, and muſt never hope for Salvation. So

that

that either *we*, or the *Jews* muſt be in a State of Damnation. Of ſuch great Importance are thoſe Matters in diſpute between us and them!

Secondly, The *Jews* are, of all Men in the World, the moſt conſiderable Enemies of Chriſtianity. They are ſo at this day, and I believe were always ſo. No doubt but the Ancient *Pagans* did their utmoſt againſt *our* Religion, and in defence of their *own*. Some Remains we have of their Attempts that way, and much is loſt. We do not find any thing of that kind that we can think formidable. And the Ancient Fathers of the Church have baffled the Pretences of that ſort with great Effect. They have not only gotten the *Victory*, but had a juſt Claim to a *Triumph* alſo. We have ſeveral Ancient Books on this Argument, that can never be anſwered. For the *Mahometans* who are much ſpread, we may be ſecure of them. If we can keep out of the reach of their Swords, we need never fear the Edge of their Arguments. The Founder of their Religion was luſtfull and cruel: he did no Miracles, and deſerves no Credit; his Followers are ſilly and ſtupid, rude and illiterate. That Religion gives the looſe to Luſt and Cruelty, to Senſuality and Fil-

Filthineſs. It hath ſpread by Violence, and Temporal Intereſts, not by any Force or Energy of Truth. It grew upon the Follies and Diviſions, and Profaneneſs of *Chriſtians*. And yet after all, thoſe of this Religion ſpeak honourably of our *Jeſus*, and are more favourable to our Religion than the *Jews* are; who ſpeak of him in Terms of Contempt and Scorn. Indeed the *Jews* are of all the Enemies to *Chriſtian* Religion, the moſt conſiderable by far. They are a People ſubtle and ſharp, of great natural Wit, and ſome Learning. They have been brought up from the Breaſt in great Prejudices againſt our Religion. They were once God's peculiar People, to them he gave his *Oracles*, that predict the Coming of *Chriſt*. Their *Sanhedrim* and Fore-fathers conſented to the Death of *Jeſus*, and rejected him as an *Impoſtor*. In this Belief they have been Educated; and, as their late *Rabbins* expound their Law, they pretend that the Predictions of it were not fulfilled in our *Jeſus*. They look for a Temporal Prince, and for worldly Greatneſs: And they bend their Studies, and all their Wits to diſparage *Jeſus*, and the Holy Goſpel. The *Deiſts* among us, who would run down our Revealed Religion, and thoſe among us who oppoſe any of its

its fundamental Articles, are but Underworkmen to the *Jews:* Their Tools and Inſtruments, with which they labour, are to be found in the Shops of the *Jews*; who are generally more dextrous in uſing them, than thoſe Men are among our ſelves who trade under them.

Thirdly, The bringing the *Jews* over to the *Chriſtian* Religion will be of great Advantage. That it will be of great Advantage to the *Jews*, no *Chriſtian* can deny, for it will put them into a State of Salvation. By this Courſe we may ſave *Souls* from Death, and hide a *Multitude of Sins.* And we doubt not but he that is the Inſtrument of ſo good a Work ſhall receive a great Reward. *They that be wiſe ſhall ſhine as the Brightneſs of the Firmament, and they that turn many to Righteouſneſs as the Stars for ever and ever*, Dan. 12. 3. The *Chriſtian* Church will receive no little Advantage likewiſe. This will be the way to enlarge its Borders, and to confirm its Faith, to leſſen its Enemies, and to ſtrengthen its weaker Members, and to baffle its Oppoſers. I add that it will be for the laſting Honour and Glory of *Chriſtian* Princes and States, who have encouraged and ſet forward ſo

bleſſed a Work. In a word, it will make Joy in Heaven, contribute to the Peace of Earth, and bring Glory to God on High.

Obj. 1. But ſome will *object* againſt this good Work, and ſay, that to attempt any thing will be loſt Labour. The *Jews* are obſtinate, and paſt hope. That 'tis a Folly to think to gain theſe Men, when their Fathers were not gained by the Miracles, and Sermons, and exemplary Life and Death of *Jeſus*; by his glorious Reſurrection, and Aſcenſion, and the wonderfull Miſſion of the Holy Ghoſt on the Day of Pentecoſt, *&c.*

Anſw. 1. It muſt be granted that it is a Work of great Difficulty: But that may be ſaid of many other things, which yet muſt not be declined. Who-ever tries will find it an hard Task to reform what is ſcandalouſly amiſs among our ſelves, though he have the Laws and Government of his ſide; ſo rampant is Vice and Profaneneſs: But ſtill I hope a good Man will not therefore be diſcouraged from doing his utmoſt. For though he ſhould ſuffer much in ſo good a Cauſe (which often happens) and ſhould at laſt be unſuc-

ſucceſsfull, yet he will not loſe his Reward. And a good Man will rejoice in ſuffering, and be willing to die in ſo good a Work. The *Jews* are obſtinate; be it ſo. Yet this only ſpeaks a Difficulty: And that alone ought not to diſcourage us, either in that, or any other good Deſign. Beſides, the *Jews* are not all alike. I have known a *Jew* that hath profeſſed to me, that though he were born a *Jew*, and brought up in that Religion, yet he was willing to become a *Chriſtian* upon Evidence and Conviction: And I hope, he had done it, had he not been prevented by Death ſoon after. I know very well that the Work is difficult; and two things eſpecially make it ſo; *viz.* the ſlaviſh Fear they are under from the Synagogue; and their general Averſion from a ſolemn and fixed Conference. I have had Experience of this my ſelf. But then the Government may in great Meaſure aſſiſt us herein.

2. 'Tis very certain, that though it be a difficult Work, yet it is not to be deſpaired of. There hath been much done this way in the ſeveral ſucceeding Ages ſince the Time of *Jeſus*. It is true, we do not pretend to that Power of Miracles

racles which was in the Church in the firſt Times of *Chriſtianity*; and (which is a ſad Conſideration) we that call our ſelves *Chriſtians*, are not exemplary in our Lives, as the Ancient *Chriſtians* were. Beſides this, a great part of thoſe who profeſs the *Chriſtian* Religion, have put Bars in the way, by departing from the Primitive Faith and Simplicity, and depraving the *Chriſtian* Faith and Manners. Theſe things cannot be denied, but we muſt confeſs them to our Shame. Yet, after all, much may be done, ſtill, this way; and I need no other Proof of it than this, that in Fact, much hath been done. In the City of *Hamburgh*, in the laſt ſeven Years, ſeveral Hundreds have been brought over to the *Chriſtian* Faith: That Reverend Perſon mentioned above, hath baptized ſeveral of the *Jewiſh* Rabbins, whoſe Names I could ſet down. I ſhall mention but one of them, and that is, *R. Jacob Melammed*, whoſe Confeſſion is printed in the *German* Language. If one Man hath been the Inſtrument of ſo many Converſions, what might not a Number of Men do, if they were encouraged and aſſiſted by publick Authority? The worthy Son of this Dr. *Edzard* (now a Preacher in *London*) hath

of

of late Years brought over ſeveral of the *Jews* to the *Chriſtian* Faith. And this is Proof enough, that how difficult ſo-ever this Work may be thought, yet it is not a deſperate Attempt. There may be very great Hopes of Succeſs, if the Government aſſiſt and encourage it. And that which hath been effected by private Perſons, cannot reaſonably be thought unpracticable, when publick Authority interpoſeth.

Obj. 2. Some perhaps may object that the converting the *Jews* will fill us with Poor. 'Tis fit theſe Converts ſhould be kept when they are in the Church; and we are already oppreſſed with our own Poor.

I anſwer,

Anſw. 1. This Objection ſuppoſeth that we ſhall gain no Proſelytes but of the pooreſt of that People, which is not to be ſuppoſed. For the Rich and the Learned will be applied to, according to the propoſed Method, as well as the Poor; and will be principally concern'd in the Defence of their Religion. This Care will bear heavieſt upon them.

2. Suppoſing we ſhould gain none but ſome of the Pooreſt, yet if they come in upon Conviction, there will not want Charity enough among *Chriſtians* to maintain them. I doubt not but there will ſoon be ſome publick Houſe erected (by voluntary Contributions) to receive them. Such Proviſion hath been formerly made for them in the City of *London*. Here they might live, under ſtrict Diſcipline, and one appointed to inſtruct them more perfectly in the *Chriſtian* Religion, and to look narrowly to their Morals, and keep them to conſtant Prayers and Holy Exerciſes.

3. The Government may (without any Shadow of Injuſtice) oblige the Synagogue to allow theſe poor Converts the very ſame Relief which they did allow them when they were *Jews*. This is not to add any new Burthen: The Synagogue cannot complain of this as any Hardſhip: It might have very good Effects: The Poor who are maintained by the Synagogue are now under a ſlaviſh Fear. And though ſome of them ſhould be enclined to turn *Chriſtians*, yet their Poverty and intire Dependance on the Synagogue for Maintainance is a Snare and Temptation to them to keep them

them in *Judaiſm* for Bread. It is not fit that theſe poor Converts ſhould *loſe* their Subſiſtence by turning *Chriſtians*; and 'tis not fit the Synagogue ſhould be the only *Gainers*. The Poor which the Synagogue hath brought upon us, they ought to maintain: Nor do we think it reaſonable, that the poor Converts ſhould loſe by becoming *Chriſtians*. But I need not inſiſt on this. I leave it, with all Submiſſion, to the Wiſdom of my Superiours.

Obj. 3. I know very well that it is commonly objected againſt attempting any thing this way, that the *Jewiſh* Converts are generally very bad Men, and a very great Reproach to the *Chriſtian* Religion which they have profeſſed; and more than that, have often continued *Jews* in their Hearts, and have declared no leſs by Apoſtatizing to *Judaiſm* again, at or before their Deaths; of which we have too much Evidence from Hiſtory.

To this I anſwer,

Anſw. 1. I do readily own that there is too much Truth in what is affirmed

in this Objection. Too many of theſe Converts have been very bad Men, and ſome have revolted to *Judaiſm* again. But then it cannot be denied but that very many of Old, and ſome of later Times, have not only been very ſincere, but have proved very eminent Lights and Ornaments in the *Chriſtian* Church. This, as to Matter of Fact, is undeniably true; and this does, in great Meaſure, anſwer the Force of the Objection.

2. It will be no hard Matter to give account of the Miſcarriage of ſome Number of them in later Times, ſince the great Decay and Corruption of *Chriſtianity*. For thoſe of them who have turned *Turks*, I am not oblig'd to account. They embraced a Lye from the Firſt, and nothing could be expected from them. For thoſe who have turned to the *Roman* Religion, it is no wonder that they ſhould prove bad Men, or relapſe, becauſe 'tis certain they could never come into the Church upon Conviction, whatever other Conſiderations might move them. For others (which are not many) they alſo cannot be excuſed: But yet it is to be feared that we cannot likewiſe. We ought to be very ſcrupulouſly careſull, whom we baptize; and

and to have more competent Aſſurance of their leading Principle, and Sincerity: But all our Care is not over aſſoon as we have baptized them. There muſt be great Care of their farther Inſtruction, and to prepare them for Confirmation, and the Holy Communion. Beſides, if they be poor, they muſt be provided with Means of a comfortable Subſiſtence. 'Tis a Shame they ſhould run about begging, and be put to hardſhip to get Bread. Our great Care muſt be to bring them over upon clear Conviction; and to take care, after that, that they neither want *Law* nor *Meal* (as the *Jews* phraſe it) that is, Inſtruction, nor Bread. If we would take due Care in the whole Matter, there will not be for the Future ſo great an Occaſion for this Objection.

To conclude,

I have in all this Matter ſpoken my Conſcience, freely. I might have added much more on this Argument. I hope, I have ſaid what is neceſſary upon this Occaſion. May God incline the Hearts of *Chriſtian* Princes and States to encou-

rage

rage ſo good a Work; and all others, according to their Capacities, to contribute to it! And may the ſame God take away the *Vail* that is upon the Hearts of the *Jews*, that they may be converted and ſaved! *Amen.*

F I N I S.

Places of Scripture Explained.

Chap. Verſ. Page

GEneſis.] *I.* 26, 27. *And God ſaid, Let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeneſs, and let them have Dominion over the Fiſh of the Sea, and over the Fowl of the Air, and over the Cattel,* &c. *So God created Man in his own Image, in the Image of God created he him, Male and Female created he them,* 174, 191, 211, 274

III. 22. *And the Lord God ſaid, behold the Man is become as one of us, to know Good and Evil,* &c. 211

IX. 20. Noah *began to be an Husbandman, and he planted a Vineyard,* 266

XLIX. 10. *The Scepter ſhall not depart from* Judah, *nor a Law-giver from between his Feet, until* SHILOH *come; and unto him ſhall the gathering of the People be,* 296, &c.

Leviticus.] *IV.* 3. *If the Prieſt that is anointed do ſin, according to the Sin of the People, then let him bring for his Sin which he hath ſinned, a young Bullock without Blemiſh, to the Lord,* 230

Deuteronomy.] *V.* 5. *I ſtood between the Lord and You, at that time, to ſhew You the Word of the Lord; for ye were afraid by reaſon of the Fire, and went not up into the Mount,* 242

VIII. 3. *He humbled thee, and ſuffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with* Manna, *that he might make thee know, that Man doth not live by Bread alone; but by every Word that proceedeth out of the Mouth of the Lord, doth Man live,* 218

1 Kings.] *XVIII.* 1. *It came to paſs after many Days, that the Word of the Lord came to* Elijah *in the third Year, ſaying, Go ſhew thy ſelf unto* Ahab, *and I will ſend Rain upon the Earth,* 81, &c.

Pſalms.] *L.* 1. *The mighty God, even the LORD, hath ſpoken; and called the Earth from the Riſing of the Sun, unto the going down thereof,* 175

Chap. Verſ. Page

Iſaiah.] *VI.* 3. *And one cried unto another, and ſaid, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hoſts; the whole Earth is full of his Glory,* 177

XXXIII. 22. *The Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Law-giver, the Lord is our King; He will ſave us,* 181, *&c.*

Jeremiah.] *XXVIII.* 7, 8, 9. *Nevertheleſs, hear thou now this word that I ſpeak in thine Ears——The Prophets that have been before me, and before thee, of old, propheſied both againſt many Countries, and againſt great Kingdoms, of War, and of Evil, and of Peſtilence,* &c. 377

XXXI. 31. *Behold the Day's come, ſaith the Lord, that I will make a New Covenant with the Houſe of* Iſrael, *and with the Houſe of* Judah, 15

XLVI. 25. *The Lord of Hoſts, the God of* Iſrael, *ſaith, Behold I will puniſh the Multitude of* No, *and* Pharaoh, *and* Egypt, *with their Gods, and their Kings; even* Pharaoh, *and them that truſt in him,* 269

Ezekiel.] *XXX.* 15. *I will pour my Fury upon* Sin, *the Strength of* Egypt; *and I will cut off the Multitude of* No, 269

Daniel.] *II.* 44. *In the Days of thoſe Kings, ſhall the God of Heaven ſet up a Kingdom, which ſhall never be deſtroyed; and the Kingdom ſhall not be left to other People, but it ſhall break in pieces, and conſume all theſe Kingdoms, and it ſhall ſtand for ever,* 66

Nahum.] *III.* 8. *Art thou better than Populous* No, *that was ſituate among the Rivers, that had the Waters round about it, whoſe Rampart was the Sea, and her Wall was from the Sea?* 270

Haggai.] *II.* 6. *Thus ſaith the Lord of Hoſts, yet once again, it is a little while, and I will ſhake the Heavens, and the Earth, and the Sea, and the Dry Land,* 12

Chap. Verſ. Page
VIII. 9. *The Silver is mine, and the Gold is mine, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts.* — *The Glory of this latter Houſe ſhall be greater than of the former, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts; and in this Place will I give Peace, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts,* 338, &c.
Zechariah.] *VI.* 12. *Thus ſpeaketh the Lord of Hoſts, ſaying, Behold the Man whoſe Name is the* BRANCH, *and he ſhall grow up out of his Place, and he ſhall build the Temple of the Lord,* 231, &c.
Malachy.] *IV.* 4. *Remember ye the Law of* Moſes *my Servant, which I commanded unto him in* Horeb, *for all* Iſrael, *with the Statutes and Judgments,* 26, &c.
Wiſdom.] *XVIII.* 15, 16. *Thine Almighty Word leapt down from Heaven, out of thy Royal Throne, as a fierce Man of War into the Midſt of a Land of Deſtruction,* &c. 203
Matthew.] *V.* 17, 18. *Think not that I am come to deſtroy the Law and the Prophets; I am not come to deſtroy, but to fulfil,* &c. 30, &c.
VIII. 32. *He ſaid unto them, go; and when they were come out, they went into the Herd of Swine; and behold the whole Herd of Swine ran violently down a ſteep Place, and periſhed in the Waters,* 87, &c.
X. 34. *Think not that I am come to ſend peace on Earth: I came not to ſend peace but a ſword,* 68, &c.
XII. 3, 4. *He ſaid unto them, have ye not read what* David *did, when he was an hungred, and they that were with him; how he entred into the Houſe of God, and did eat the Shew-bread?* &c. 78, &c.
XXVI. 17, 18. *The firſt Day of the Feaſt of Unleavened-bread, the Diſciples came to* Jeſus, *ſaying unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the Paſſover?* &c. 109, &c. 113
Ib. 34. Jeſus *ſaith unto him, Verily, I ſay unto thee, that this Night, before the Cock crow, thou ſhalt deny me thrice,* 98, &c.

Mat-

Chap. Verſ. Page

Matthew.] *XXVIII.* 18. Jeſus *came and ſpake unto them ſaying, All Power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth,* 128, *&c.*

Mark.] *X.* 19. *Thou knoweſt the Commandments; Do not commit adultery; Do not kill; Do not ſteal; Do not bear falſe witneſs; Defraud not; Honour thy Father and Mother,* 84, *&c.*

Luke.] *IV.* 25. *I tell you of a truth, many Widows were in* Iſrael, *in the Days of* Elias, *when the Heaven was ſhut up three Years, and ſix Months,* &c. 80, *&c.*

John.] *VII.* 38, 39. *He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath ſaid, out of his Belly ſhall flow Rivers of living Water.——But this ſpake he of the Spirit,* &c. 104, *&c.*

XVI. 7, 13. *I tell you the truth, It is expedient for you that I go away: For if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will ſend him unto you,* &c. 101, *&c.*

XIX. 14, 31. *——It was the Preparation of the Paſſeover, and about the ſixth Hour,* &c. *The* Jews, *therefore, becauſe it was the Preparation, that the Bodies ſhould not remain upon the Croſs on the Sabbath-day (for that Sabbath-day was an high Sabbath)* beſought Pilate *that their Legs might be broken,* &c. 114, *&c.*

XXI. 25. *There are alſo many other things which* Jeſus *did, the which, if they ſhould be written every one, I ſuppoſe that even the World it ſelf could not contain the Books that ſhould be written,* &c. 129, *&c.*

Romans.] *III.* 31. *Do we then make void the Law through Faith? God forbid; yea we eſtabliſh the Law,* 35, *&c.*

Galatians.] *III.* 10. *As many as are of the Works of the Law are under the Curſe: For it is written, Curſed is every one that continueth not in all things, which are written in the Book of the Law, to do them,* 134, *&c.*

He-

Chap. Verſ. Page
Hebrews.] *III.* 12. *Take heed, Brethren, leſt there be, in any of you, an evil Heart of Unbelief, in departing from the Living God,* 203
IX. 19. *When* Moſes *had ſpoken every Precept, to all the People, according to the Law, he took the Blood of Calves, and of Goats, with Water, and Scarlet-wool, and Hyſſop, and ſprinkled both the Book, and all the People,* 144, *&c.*
XII. 26, 27. *Whoſe Voice then ſhook the Earth: But now he hath promiſed, ſaying, Yet once more, I ſhake not the Earth only, but alſo Heaven,* &c. 14, *&c.*
1 John.] *V.* 7. *There are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt; and theſe three are one,* 160, *&c.*

THE END.

ERRATA.

PAge 155. l. 29. r. *renders.* P. 158. l. 24: r. *Rabbins.* P. 187. l. 8. dele, *to.* P. 204. l. 12, *&c.* for x. r. χ. P. 224: l. 6.—*vis.* r. *vius.* Ib. *dele,* u. P. 233. l. 13. r.—*udes.*

Books written by the Right Reverend Father in God, Richard, *Lord Bishop of* Bath *and* Wells.

A Commentary on the Five Books of *Moſes*; with a Diſſertation concerning the Author or Writer of the ſaid Books; and a general Argument to each of them. In 2 Vol. 8*vo.*

A Sermon upon the Reſurrection; Preached before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor, and Court of Aldermen, at St. *Bride*'s Church, on *Eaſter*-Monday, 1694. Both printed for *W. Rogers.*

A Demonſtration of the *Meſſias*, in which the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion is defended, eſpecially againſt the *Jews.* Part II. Printed for *W. Rogers*, and *M. Wotton*

Twelve Sermons Preached upon ſeveral Occaſions. Printed for *B. Aylmer*, and *M. Wotton.*